

The HISTORICAL BULLETIN

A CATHOLIC QUARTERLY
for Teachers and Students of History

Vol. XIX

November • 1940

No. 1

The Catholic Press and the Civil War

Toward a Philosophy of History

History in the High School

The General of the Suppressed Jesuits

Portugal and the Society of Jesus

England's Immunity to Attack

Book Reviews

Editorials

25c a Copy

\$1.00 a Year

FOR EVERY CATHOLIC COLLEGE LIBRARY—

THE MODERN SCHOOLMAN

A REVIEW OF SCHOLASTIC PHILOSOPHY

Three Reasons
why The Modern Schoolman is unique in the field of Philosophy

1. Short and readable articles on fundamental problems of philosophy from a Scholastic point of view. Suitable for class supplementary reading.
2. Its contributors are authoritative—outstanding teachers and students of philosophy.
3. Subscription is \$1.00 a year—the only review of its kind at this low price.

COMING IN JANUARY—A Selective Bibliography for Scholastic Philosophy

Published quarterly at

ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY
ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI

ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY

ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI

Includes the following Schools and Colleges and Affiliated Institutions

CONSTITUENT SCHOOLS

College of Arts and Sciences.....	221 North Grand Blvd.
College of Arts and Sciences at Florissant.....	Florissant, Mo.
Graduate School.....	15 North Grand Blvd.
School of Divinity.....	St. Mary's College, St. Marys, Kansas
School of Medicine.....	1402 S. Grand Blvd.
School of Law.....	3642 Lindell Blvd.
School of Philosophy and Science.....	3638 Lindell Blvd.
School of Dentistry.....	3556 Caroline Street
School of Commerce and Finance.....	3674 Lindell Blvd.
School of Education and Social Science.....	15 North Grand Blvd.
School of Nursing:	

1. St. Mary's Hospital Unit.....1101 Bellevue Avenue
2. University Unit.....1402 South Grand Blvd.

THE CORPORATE COLLEGES

Fontbonne College.....	Wydown and Big Bend Blvds.
Maryville College.....	Meramec and Nebraska Avenues
Webster College.....	Lockwood Blvd., Webster Groves, Missouri
Notre Dame Junior College.....	Ripa Avenue, South Saint Louis
Saint Mary's Junior College.....	O'Fallon, Missouri

THE HOSPITALS

1. UNIVERSITY HOSPITALS
 - (a) St. Mary's Hospital.....Clayton and Bellevue Avenues
 - (b) Firmin Desloge Hospital.....1325 South Grand Blvd.
 - (c) Mt. St. Rose Sanatorium.....9101 South Broadway
2. AFFILIATED HOSPITALS
 - (a) Alexian Brothers' Hospital.....3933 South Broadway
 - (b) St. Anthony's Hospital.....Grand Blvd. and Chippewa
 - (c) St. John's Hospital.....307 South Euclid Avenue

3. STAFF-RELATED HOSPITALS

- (a) St. Mary's Infirmary.....1536 Papin Street
- (b) St. Louis City Hospital, Unit I.....1550 Lafayette Ave.
- (c) St. Louis City Hospital, Unit II.....2945 Lawton Ave.
- (d) St. Louis City Sanitarium.....5300 Arsenal Street
- (e) St. Louis Isolation Hospital.....5800 Arsenal Street

AFFILIATED NURSING SCHOOLS

- (a) Alexian Brothers' Hospital School of Nursing—
3933 South Broadway
- (b) St. Mary's Hospital School of Nursing.....East St. Louis, Ill.

THE OUT-PATIENT SERVICES

1. THE UNIVERSITY OUT-PATIENT DEPARTMENT
Firmin Desloge Hospital.....1325 South Grand Boulevard
2. THE ASSOCIATED OUT-PATIENT DEPARTMENTS
 - (a) Alexian Brothers' Dispensary.....3933 South Broadway
 - (b) St. John's Dispensary.....312 North 23rd Street

THE STAFF-RELATED OUT-PATIENT DEPARTMENTS

- (a) City Dispensary.....1550 Lafayette Avenue
- (b) The Obstetric Dispensaries
St. Louis Obstetrical Hospital Association
St. Ann's Foundling Asylum
- (c) The Pre-Natal Clinics
The Cass Avenue Clinic
The Bethesda Dispensary

WHITE HOUSE

- St. Louis House of Retreats—
White House, Jefferson Barracks P. O., Missouri

The HISTORICAL BULLETIN

A CATHOLIC QUARTERLY
for Teachers and Students of History

Published quarterly in November, January, March and May by the Missouri Province Educational Institute, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo. Price: 25c a copy; \$1.00 a year. Entered as second-class matter January 7, 1932, at the Post Office at St. Louis, Mo., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on January 20, 1933.

VOL. XIX

NOVEMBER, 1940

No. 1

Table of Contents

PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY	DEMETRIUS B. ZEMA	3
CATHOLIC PRESS AND CIVIL WAR	BENJAMIN BLIED	5
EDITORIALS		7
PORTUGAL AND THE SOCIETY OF JESUS	EDWARD G. HAGEMANN	9
THE GENERAL OF THE SUPPRESSED JESUITS	PETER M. DUNNE	11
ENGLAND'S IMMUNITY FROM ATTACK	JOHN B. CONNORTON	13
HISTORY IN THE HIGH SCHOOL	W. B. FAHERTY	17
BOOK REVIEWS		20

THE HISTORICAL BULLETIN is indexed in the Catholic Magazine Index of *The Catholic Bookman* and *The Catholic Periodical Index*

Toward a Philosophy of History

Demetrius B. Zema, S. J., Ph. D., F. R. H. S.

Fordham University

IF HISTORICAL studies in our colleges and universities are to be pursued with adequate breadth and depth, it is not sufficient to provide our libraries with an ample stock of source material and our faculties with a technically trained personnel. There must also be ready to hand a guide of interpretation in a true and valid philosophy of history: a philosophy, to wit, that rests on the broad basic factors operating in all historical events, and upon universally valid principles so clearly formulated that they can be readily applied to meet quite squarely all the divergent theories now current, and, at the same time, give the clue to that deeper meaning of events and movements which best tallies with all known facts. For there is meaning and causality in historical events so much larger than the events themselves, and so much larger even than the particular period marked by those events, that it cannot be discerned from the short range of proximate causes, effects and circumstances.

How are the bearing and direction of historical phenomena to be determined and understood not merely in terms of their significance for a particular situation, but also in terms of final values and the ultimate goal of human progress? That is the broad question a philosophy of history has to answer.

To give that question its full dimensions, consider more closely what the answer implies. Taking the basic operative factors of history to be (1) *man* acting individually or in groups; (2) the *physical world* that is his stage; (3) the *cultural milieu* around him; and (4) the *supernatural world* to which man belongs with all that touches him, only reflect on the bewildering complexity of the historical scene. Think of man's multiple relations to

each of the factors named, and of each factor to the other. Note further how frequently man's free will cuts athwart established regularity, introducing cross-purposes, contradictions and evil into the course of events, complicating them almost beyond human unraveling. Can any science unweave the tangled skein and enable us to discern a purposive unity through it all; to formulate laws of history and establish a norm of values such as will make it possible for the philosopher-historian to see the long-range import of each event with at least an approximation to accuracy and truth? Does such a feat lie within the power of man's genius?

Some think not. Thus, no less subtle a thinker than Jacques Maritain deems the task a super-human one when, in the opening words of his essay on "Rousseau" in the *Three Reformers*, he declares "The Angels who see all the happenings of the universe in the creative ideas, know the philosophy of history; philosophers cannot know it. . . . And as to detecting the causes and supreme laws working through the stream of incident, to do that we should need to share the counsel of the supreme Fashioner, or be directly enlightened by Him. That is why it is properly a prophetic work to deliver to men the philosophy of their history."

Similarly does R. L. Marshall in an article "The Search for a Philosophy of History" published in *Studies* for June, 1916, see insuperable obstacles in the way of formulating a philosophy of history. "Scientific knowledge of a fact" he says "... requires a complete knowledge of all the conditions under which the fact has occurred. . . . The individual differences always present amongst mankind is the supreme hindrance in the path of valid

generalization and consequently to the formulation of a philosophy of history. . . . We have failed to gather by historical method sufficient proof to warrant us legitimately assuming the existence of any single permanent cause of evolution indwelling in human nature in general. . . . The result is, as far as the philosophy of history is concerned, a mild form of chaos."

To such a defeatist attitude towards a philosophy of history, I cannot, frankly, subscribe; nor to the faulty conception of history upon which it seems to rest. That it is impossible for the human intellect, in view of its natural limitations, to attain a fully *adequate* knowledge of anything, one must readily admit. Only God possesses that. Moreover, that the exploration of ultimate causes and the tracing of causal relations amid the very complex and subtle interplay of cause and effect in human affairs, wherein man's free will introduces so many sudden turns and contingencies, entails many difficulties, no one can doubt. But that it is hopelessly beyond human wit to attain such a knowledge of the basic causes of history and of ultimate goals and values, as is sufficient for man's practical purposes and guidance here below, and that it is, therefore, useless to attempt to formulate a philosophy of history, that I am loath to admit. The task is arduous and long, indeed, but not impossible.

Let me now state more pointedly than I have done, what I conceive a philosophy of history to be. If history is the science which ascertains the past activities of men and other socially important events, and reconstructs these in their concrete causal relations so as to trace thereby the development of civilization and culture; and if philosophy is the science which seeks an ordered knowledge of the primal causes of things; then the philosophy of history is the science which explores the ultimate constituent, efficient and final causes of those activities and events, in order to trace therein rational design and purposive unity, and the ultimate goal of human progress.

It is not enough for a historian merely to record events like a chronicler. He must also be able to pass judgment and declare whether certain changes are good or bad, desirable or undesirable, whether they spell backward or forward movement. In order to judge this, he must have before him a plan and points of orientation. He must have some idea of the grand organic totality of which any phase of history is a part, and in the light of which the part is to be understood, remembering the while that an organic whole is, in truth, greater than the sum of its parts.

Our concern with history, therefore, is by no means exhausted in ascertaining the actuality of past events even in their organic and causal integration. There arises the problem as to the relation of the historical process or march of events in the world to the fundamental forces of the universe, to clarify which it is necessary to take account of the connection between the physical and the psychical world, on the one hand, and the elevation of these two to the supernatural, on the other. There arises also the problem regarding the significance of the historical process for the operative human will—the principal efficient cause of historical events—which, though itself moved by events, yet constantly exercises a determining power of its own. To this second problem belong the

questions relating to the teachings of history for man's guidance in the immediate concerns of life and for his ultimate concerns as well.

Some of these questions, it is plain, lie outside the sphere of empirical historiography and belong in reality to the philosophy of history. In other words, there are metaphysical relations beyond and behind the discernible facts which give these coherence and which can be seized only in the delineations on a larger and more comprehensive canvas than that of the historical foreground.

These metaphysical presuppositions are of the highest practical importance. Only by their aid can one transcend the apparent contradictions of history and establish a complete and final system of values by which to set institutions, movements, single events and personalities in their true perspective and importance.

Formulating a Philosophy of History

The attempt to formulate the philosophy of history as an autonomous science is comparatively recent. It has followed the development of the scientific system in the course of which many branches of learning differentiated themselves more and more completely from the comprehensive fields of which they were once reckoned a part. Thus, history weaned itself from the "Poetry" of the Greeks; sociology from philosophy; economics from politics, and so on. Following this process, it is only in recent times that history has come to be regarded as a science in its own right, with principles and methods specially applicable to it, and by the same evolution it has paved the way for a philosophy of history.

The thinkers of antiquity, who laid the foundations of philosophical science, were not in possession of many facts and truths on which a philosophy of history must rest. For example, the idea of the unity of the human race; the co-operation of man's free will with Providence; the idea of universal history and of the interrelation and interpenetration of cultures. Nor was the intrinsic purpose of historiography generally understood to be genetic, rather than narrative and didactic.

As for the Jewish people and the early Christians, it is, of course, perfectly true that both the Old and the New Testament furnished them with the most essential data for a philosophy of history. It is also true that St. Augustine offers us, in his *City of God*, the first grand panorama of universal history through the entire course of which he traces the guiding hand of Divine Providence. Augustine's providential conception of history also moulded the mind of the Middle Ages in this matter, while Bossuet gave it classical form in his *Discours sur l'histoire universelle*. Yet, strangely enough, it was Voltaire, it seems, who first hit upon the designation "Philosophy of History", though there is little philosophy in Voltaire's essay so entitled, and just as little history. Nevertheless, "the patriarch of Ferney" made current a term which in reality finds its best verification in the Christian conception of the world and of history.

But the advance of the physical and social sciences was making new demands upon the philosophy of history by confronting it with facts, questions and challenges not forced upon St. Augustine, Otto of Freising, or Bossuet. The centuries from the seventeenth to the twentieth have

(Please turn to page 15)

The Catholic Press and the Civil War

Reverend Benjamin Blied

St. Francis Seminary, St. Francis, Wisconsin

OUR Catholic press came into existence during the first quarter of the nineteenth century. Its period of adolescence covered the next twenty-five years, and in 1861 it was well able to tackle the problem of the day. Several papers had considerable history behind them: The *United States Catholic Miscellany* had begun publication in 1822, the *Cincinnati Telegraph* dated from 1831, and even the exciting *Freeman's Journal* dated back to 1840. Of course, the influence of these papers—as today—was limited to Catholic circles. Naturally the papers differed greatly from those of the present. Spectacular headlines and photographs were absent, and it was customary to reproduce many lengthy pastoral letters. Then, too, articles were often copied from other papers, but this penury was pleasantly offset by the editorial warfare of men like McMaster and Perch .

Although the North was the stronghold of Catholicity, and therefore had the stronger Catholic press, the South possessed fearless anti-federal journals such as *Le Propagateur Catholique*, the *New Orleans Standard*, and the *U. S. Catholic Miscellany*, while publications of the border area such as the *Baltimore Mirror*, and the *Louisville Guardian* catered to a southern clientele. The war dealt harshly with these. The *Miscellany* was so meticulously logical that it dropped the first part of its title because the words "United States" were henceforth "without truth or meaning". Although the very first year of the war marked the death of that sturdy Catholic pioneer, it would be a mistake to ascribe the paper's demise to the war; the *Miscellany* had long been having financial difficulties. The *Propagateur Catholique* had been founded in 1842 by Father Perch  to combat Voltarianism, and while it quite correctly related the Abolition crusade to the naturalistic humanitarianism of the French Revolution, the general tone of the paper was violent. Thus it characterized the first inaugural of Lincoln as a "masterpiece of astuteness and hypocrisy filled with contradictions, threats, and promises," and it explained quite pointedly that the South opposed Lincoln because he was chosen to destroy its institutions and to reverse the constitution; if the South was rebellious, it maintained, she was merely imitating Washington. The editor was equally blunt in castigating the Protestants as the party responsible for the Civil War and for many other revolutions, because they had rejected the principle of authority.¹ When the South began to collapse, Perch 's paper was suspended, but the editor, despite his ill-advised violence, later became archbishop of New Orleans.

While Perch 's scanty sheet was limited in circulation owing to its language and high price (\$4.50 per year), the *Baltimore Mirror*, which was of usual size and cost only half as much, circulated over considerable territory. Father Cuthbert Allen has carefully compared the *Mirror* with the *Freeman's Journal* and the similarity of thought

is remarkable. With this work easily accessible, further comment is, we hope, superfluous.²

The *Louisville Guardian* was dissolved in 1861 after three years of existence. Being published near the scene of conflict, the disruption of postal service made continuance impossible. Moreover, with Cincinnati close by, the prospects of rivalling the two older papers of that city could never have been bright.

During the six months prior to the outbreak of the war the *Guardian* blamed the Protestant clergy for the sorry state of the nation. An editorial of November 24, 1860, stated in part:

There is no doubt that the Protestant sects have had at least as much to do with the present unfortunate state of things as the excited sectional politicians. . . . In the North, the Protestant preachers have been long in the habit of bitterly inveighing, Sunday after Sunday, against the evil and the sin of slavery; this has, in fact, formed the chief burden of their discourses from the pulpit. . . . The religious fanaticism has evidently led the way to that political excitement which now threatens to sever our glorious Union, and to leave it a mass of ruins. Take away the Protestant element from the discussion, and little would remain.

The next issue of the paper observed that too many people in the North erroneously believed the South was only talking about secession to frighten the Northerners into complying with Southern demands. Catholics, being found on both sides, should counteract abolition fanaticism, and in the South they should strive to prevent secession until all means of justice should prove ineffectual. The *Guardian* repeated this exhortation to moderation, but all the more pointedly did it indite the ministers who, using the same Bible, denounced slavery in the North and eulogized it in the South.³

The *Cincinnati Telegraph*, much like the others, carried an editorial in December 1860 entitled, "The Union and Catholicity," in which the editor censured the sects, with the possible exception of the Episcopalians, for promoting discord. "Religious fanaticism was dragged in to give darker meaning to a difference of social polity and local interests." The Catholic Church, on the other hand, has exhorted both the North and South to be just, moderate, patient, and charitable. Hence, if the Union is dissolved, no guilt will attach to her. The Northern Puritans, however, couldn't exist without persecuting someone, so they tormented the South till it could endure it no longer. Such was the lot of the South, despite the fact that it never received a just share of the profits made by the partnership of North and South.⁴

The *Telegraph* at times calmly cited the *Propagateur* and the *Miscellany* but already early in 1861 it was clear that the paper was not promoting disloyalty. In an editorial, "The Union", Catholics were admonished of their duty to adhere to the Union.⁵ A controversial article of March 16, 1861, called attention to the fact that the *Telegraph* had not advocated disunion, but merely averred that the South had reasons to complain and a right to be respected. Immediately after the war broke out the

¹ *Propagateur Catholique*, Mch. 6, 1861, June 15, 1861, Jan., *passim*, 1862. Almost every issue breathes unbounded enthusiasm for the South.

² See United States Cath. Historical Society, *Historical Records and Studies*, XXVI.

³ *Guardian*, Jan. 5, 1861; Feb. 23, 1861

⁴ *Telegraph*, Dec. 1, 1860

⁵ *Ibid.*, Jan. 26, 1861

editor wrote that the President had spoken, that although he had believed that the South had been imposed upon, it was now necessary to put aside individual opinions.⁶ Nevertheless, Southern views still found space in the journal's columns, as is indicated by the letter of Bishop Quinlan of Mobile, wherein he amplified his vigorous pro-South letter of January 1, 1861, and explained that to label the Southern confederacy an oligarchy was a grave error because in reality it was a popular movement.⁷

In 1862 the paper denounced those who would resist a draft,⁸ and the following year when the draft riots of New York occurred, the readers were encouraged to uphold law and order.⁹ The issue that brought the *Telegraph* simultaneous praise and blame was slavery. Most of the praise came from non-Catholic sources. Although the paper was never an abolitionist sheet, it did accept Lincoln's argumentation. After his proclamation, the *Telegraph* commented that few would contest the right to confiscate property as a means of winning the war. Slaves were classified as property, Ergo.¹⁰ When the editor decided on his policy of rejoicing over the death of slavery, he feared financial difficulty, but that fear proved unfounded.¹¹ He did, however, frequently receive the epithet "Abolitionist," and, not feeling flattered, he explained that he had been devoted to the cause of order, and therefore could not assail what was protected by law, but once the great evil had received its lethal blow, he wanted no revival of it.

The *Telegraph*, in its issue of July 29, 1863, quoted the *Central Illinoian* to the effect that the Catholic Church had a strong anti-slavery record even though American Catholics had largely voted Democratic. Priests had encouraged obedience to the government more than the Protestant ministers, and the clergy's dislike of slavery would ingratiate the Church in America. While such notices won editorial approval, the *Pilot*, with its pro-slavery attitude, was assailed with many jibes.¹² The *Telegraph*, however, went quite far in asserting that: "If the question of American slavery were to be submitted tomorrow to a general council of the Church, the institution would perish—sunken deeper than ever plummet sounded."¹³ Lastly, the editor observed that as long as the South maintains slavery, manual labor will be scorned, white laborers will not settle there, and the Church will not prosper.

The issue of April 8, 1863, carried an article to the effect that the Church and slavery never agreed well, but that the Church does not use revolutionary means to correct evils; she prefers to be patient, tolerating what she is unable to suppress. This was substantially the stand of the other Catholic paper of Cincinnati, the *Wahrheitsfreund*, which had little to say about slavery although its columns were rich in Civil War news.¹⁴

The Boston *Pilot* was so strongly devoted to the Irish, that it criticized Lincoln for being ungrateful to them.¹⁵ Their splendid fighting obtained no prominent appointments! In answer to criticism in the New York *Tablet* the *Pilot* made it clear that for years it had wanted the constitution amended to carry out the original intent of that document and thus to protect the rights of the South. Previously, the *Pilot* had advised: "Hands off the South;" now it said: "Stand by the Stars and Stripes."¹⁶ The height of bitterness was reached when the *Charleston Daily Courier* accused the *Pilot* of having warred on Southern institutions, but the *Pilot* was not slow to point to its ten year record of discouraging abolitionism in its stronghold, and it also observed that the South had many friends among the Irish.¹⁷ The *Pilot* was loyal to the Union, but it insisted on respecting Southern rights, even though it could not approve all Southern actions.

The Pittsburgh *Catholic*, dating from 1844, was outstandingly loyal, and was even branded "a Black Republican sheet", a name it did not deserve. Immediately after the campaign of 1860, the editor tried to allay fears by putting forth the opinion that many who voted for Lincoln were not abolitionists, and that the President would act fairly toward the South. In his estimation, many Republicans were willing to leave slavery in the South alone, even though the party opposed its extension to the territories.¹⁸ The issue of December 29, 1860, insisted that it was a duty to uphold the Union, and that South Carolina was not justified in seceding for the reason that revolutionary action is lawful only when all legal means of redress have failed. Since the editor hoped to see every Catholic defending the Union, his interpretation of the constitution was simple and direct. He wrote: "To say that a state can secede at pleasure, is to insult the memory of the framers of the constitution, who were not such sorry bunglers as to construct a government that could be dissolved by any malcontent member."

The issue of March 2, 1861, carried an editorial to the effect that the Church does not interfere in social and political matters except when morality is involved. Although the slave trade has been condemned, slavery has been spared. The editor disliked slavery, but thought it could not be suddenly shuffled off. As for Protestantism, the *Catholic* gave it generous credit for contributing to the national calamity.¹⁹ Catholics were exhorted to back the President in whatever means he would choose in this emergency, and the *Propagateur* was taken to task for its assertions. The North did not want to subjugate the South, but only to live peacefully under the constitution.²⁰ By secession the South wronged the North, and that could not be glossed over. At the time many expected a "no popery" crusade to follow the war as a sequel to

⁶ *Ibid.*, Apr. 20, 1861

⁷ *Ibid.*, July 13, 1861. For the New Year's letter, see *Freeman's Journal*, Mch. 2, 1861, also *Wahrheitsfreund*, June 11, 1862

⁸ *Telegraph*, Aug. 20, 1862

⁹ *Ibid.*, July 22, 1863. The rôle of Archbishop Hughes was given an abundance of space in the secular press. As a sample of hatred of the Irish involved, see the *Philadelphia Press*, July 17, 20, 1863.

¹⁰ *Telegraph*, Oct. 1, 1862

¹¹ *Ibid.*, May 6, 1863

¹² E. q. Sept. 9, 1863. The *Pilot* also made attacks on the *Telegraph*, e. q. July 25, 1863, Aug. 1, 1863.

¹³ *Telegraph*, Aug. 26, 1863

¹⁴ *Wahrheitsfreund*, Aug. 17, 1837, Apr. 20, 1854

¹⁵ *Pilot*, Aug. 24, 1861. The *Pilot* was definitely an Irish paper

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, May 18, 1861.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, May 25, 1861.

¹⁸ *Catholic*, Nov. 24, 1860.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

²⁰ *Catholic*, Apr. 27, 1861

(Please turn to page 18)

The HISTORICAL BULLETIN

A CATHOLIC QUARTERLY

for Teachers and Students of History

RAYMOND CORRIGAN, *Editor*

Staff

WALTER F. HARRIS
RAYMOND J. DERRIG
EUGENE O. LATTA
EMMETT A. KILKER
VIRGIL C. BLUM

RICHARD L. PORTER
ALBERT C. ZABOLIO
CHARLES J. MEHOK
PETER O. PRICE
GEORGE M. PIEPER

Advisory Board

MARTIN J. HARNEY
Boston College
THOMAS F. MAHER
Gonzaga University
CHARLES H. METZGER
West Baden College

FRANCIS S. BETTEN
Marquette University
W. PATRICK DONNELLY
Spring Hill College
PETER M. DUNNE
University of San Francisco

GERALD G. WALSH
Fordham University

RAYMOND R. MCAULEY, *Business Manager*

Address communications to The Historical Bulletin, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.

EDITORIALS

Propaganda Three Hundred Years Ago

If there is an overworked word in the language, that word is "propaganda." There is propaganda for the learned and for the illiterate, for the hard-fisted money grabber and for the idealist, for the religious-minded and for the earth-bound. There is the remote conditioning process as well as the more or less direct appeal for sympathy. Experts have card-indexed our gullibility, our ignorance, our greed, our generous impulses. The amount of clear thinking behind the radio, the press or even the whispering campaign is frequently in inverse ratio to the misty thought effort of the childish masses. Here, surely, is plenty of grist for the historical mills of the future.

But the past also had its propaganda to worry and confuse the historians of today. It is, of course, to be expected that we should have an improved technique and that operations should be on a grander scale. The growing sophistication of people who have been fooled more than once is balanced out by the greater efficiency of the moulders of public opinion. The victim populace learns by experience, no doubt, but experience also teaches that later generations will hardly be wiser than ourselves. Still, there is some possibility that the over-dose we are now receiving may produce a revulsion of feeling and a consequent temporary immunity to wholesale deception.

This moralizing is a long approach to a few reflections on "propaganda during the Thirty Years War." Elmer A. Beller has set forth his researches in this field with an eye to the more than academic interest which the topic is likely to arouse at present. His graphic volume is briefly reviewed in this issue of the BULLETIN.

Among the records of an older generation that saw Germany suffer something comparable to Europe's darkest hour he discovers a war of books, pamphlets and broadsides. There were protests in the name of "civilization"; there were accusations of atrocities, including "murder, infanticide, torture, rape and arson." To discredit the enemy and boost the morale at home were the main general objectives. Writers simplified the issues for peasants around the tavern table, and mystified petty princes with high-sounding verbiage. They appealed alike

to reason and to revelation. They published official documents and (less modern than our bourgeois world) buttressed their arguments with long quotations from Holy Scripture. They allayed fears by revealing the weakness of the foe and stimulated flagging courage by assurances of certain victory. Propaganda, however amateurish according to our standards, was an effective instrument in a futile and suicidal war three hundred years ago.

Universal History in a Nut-shell

As an armory of dates for rapid reference, as an over-view of the record of all time, *An Encyclopedia of World History* (Houghton Mifflin, \$5.50) will be an invaluable aid to the mature student. The tiro, who doesn't know that even a dictionary may propagate a lop-sided *Weltanschauung*, should be taught to use it with caution. One who merely consults it to refresh his own feeble chronology may continue long in a feeling of unmixed gratitude to the publisher and to Professor William L. Langer, the editor. But the reviewer is forced to be a bit more critical.

We have two major grievances. In one instance, Christianity suffers by the retailing of bad history; in another, the idea of man is distorted by bad common sense. And in the present world crisis, not even the accuracy of ten thousand more or less significant dates will compensate for the injury done by a subtle attack on truths that really matter. If man is a refined ape, and Christianity an historical accident, we may as well let "civilization" go to the dogs,—since after all the dogs are just as good as we are. This is not indignation; it is merely an expression of disappointment.

Shock number one came on page one of the big book. "Man is distinguished from the higher apes," we are told, "by the greater size of his brain, his fully erect position in walking, the better adaptation of his hands for grasping and holding, and his use of language for communication." Now, this is all true as far as it goes. But here the paragraph ends. Man has been put into his "place among the animals" and left there. One would like to assume the writer intended Joe Freshman to reason from "language" to thoughts to a thinking principle. If

we seem to be hypersensitive on this point, it is because language is too often misused to deny the soul in man and the existence of God Whose creative act alone explains the essential difference between ourselves and "our animal ancestors." The mightiest maniac on earth has taught his conquering race "to think with our blood." The evolutionists are abetting the process of reversion.

Shock number two is like a slap in the face. "Such oriental religions as those of the Egyptian Isis, the Persian Mithras and the Jewish Jesus Christ" are introduced, apparently for the first time, to compete with Stoic philosophy. If man differs but slightly from the ape, why should the Church founded by the Son of God differ at all from rival sects? If "scientific" half-truths from Darwin can be decked out to obscure the origin of human reason, "rationalist" half-truths from the less scientific Gibbon can be juggled into a repudiation of divine revelation. Our quarrel is not with the scholars who have laboriously dug out half-truths which increase our total sum of knowledge. Any one who has ever gone through the agony of a little research can sympathize with the specialist who loses his perspective by too much concentration on dark corners. What we dislike is the pseudo-learning of compilers who still cater to the outmoded "modern mind."

The Church welcomes whatever truth is unearthed by archeology, biology or sane historical criticism. But we don't like the copying and recopying of mere hypotheses until they are erected into "facts" by sheer repetition. The story of the early Church as set down in the new *Encyclopedia* is based on the kind of guess-work that makes bad history. But our chief complaint is that the origins of the most vital institution in two thousand years of Europe's past is treated as a mere incident in the political history of this or that country.

And now that we have expressed our most unkind thoughts, we repeat that students will find the book a valuable aid to quick information, especially political, military and diplomatic. The old-time handy Ploetz-Tillinghast has been much improved. Over a period of seventy years it has evolved, with human help, of course, from an *Auszug* for German readers to an *Epitomé* in English dress to a *Handbook of Universal History* to a *Manual of Universal History* (under the dubious auspices of the much warped Harry Elmer Barnes) to the present attractive *Encyclopedia of World History*. With some reservation we recommend this "Bird's eye view of the biography of man." As a store-house of dates the book is will be an excellent investment.

Three Recent Text Books

A few years ago I began a review of a rather flimsy study of Joan of Arc by stating that the author was a Rationalist. The review was immediately and severely taken to task because it seemed to approve a book that missed the whole meaning of a saint's life! Perhaps, one should be more explicit. The Rationalist himself quite generally relishes being called such. He thinks the word stands for objectivity, facts, common sense, reason. Deliberately dwarfed and circumscribed in his view of reality, and decidedly uncritical in the cult of his idol, he feels that he can magnanimously ignore the criticism of

inferior people who still cling to ancient superstitions! It will appear somewhat crude on our part to express a regret that the growing tribe of rationalists is so immune to insult. In some cases the misfortune is no direct fault of the victim. In all cases, we have something analogous to the contented state of the mental defective.

When he deals with Christ Our Lord, with Christianity or with Christendom the Rationalist has one doubtful advantage. He attaches primary, even exclusive importance to the purely natural. Consequently, he is likely to probe more deeply in his search for hidden factors, and to set forth his findings with the tingle and glow of satisfied achievement. The children of God, on the other hand, usually take altogether too much for granted. They feel secure, often numbly secure, in the possession of truth, and so miss the fun and the healthy exercise incident to looking for things in the dark.

Our long slow approach leads to this. Once you are aware of the peculiar mentality of an author you know pretty well what to expect. If all religion is mere superstition, if the destiny of man is to be attained by his reaching a high place among the higher animals, some of our recent historians are doing a valiant work. But if these rationalizers are building upon an hypothesis, a very flimsy hypothesis, they are dangerous guides, whatever their ability to assemble facts and present them in literary form. And now for a hurried glance at three recent text books.

Professor Geise of Pittsburg has given us well over a thousand pages of interesting reading (*Man and the Western World*. Harcourt, Brace. 1940). There is much that we like in the book. But it would be easy to disagree with a hundred statements. We like his diagrams, chronological tables and, quantitatively speaking, most of his narrative. We have a strong preference for the kind of history which keeps man and distinctly human forces to the fore. But when, in his Preface, the author pays tribute to Harry Elmer Barnes we immediately cross our fingers and wait for a bad philosophy to break out all over the abundant flow of erudition. And it does.

A less ambitious, and a less precarious course is followed by Charles Edward Smith and Lynn M. Case (*A Short History of Western Civilization*. D. C. Heath. 1940. \$4.00). After an allusion or two to primitive "man," in which they are less clever than Professor Geise, they follow more or less traditional lines. They avoid anything like a slurring repudiation of Divine Providence, the Christian religion or the moral law, a merely negative virtue, if you will, but pleasingly more wholesome and in better taste than some irritating passages in other books. They are more scientific and decidedly less dogmatic than the author of *Man and the Modern World*. Apparently, they have no Voltairean *Weltanschauung* to propagate. They make a visible effort to tell the story straight, and to keep aloof from controversy.

In his *Development of Contemporary Civilization* (D. C. Heath. 1940. \$3.75) William J. Bossenbrook and eleven of his colleagues give us a usable survey of modern expansion through two centuries of optimism down to the disillusionment of yesterday. This volume

(Please turn to page 19)

Portugal and the Society of Jesus

Edward H. Hagemann, S. J.

Alma College, Alma, California

DURING 1940 much has been written about the fourth centenary of the Society of Jesus. Before the year closes it may not be inappropriate to draw attention to two other celebrations that occur this year. Portugal commemorates this year the eighth centenary of her independence, and the Society of Jesus commemorates the fourth centenary of its entrance into that country. Portugal in 1540 was one of the important nations of Europe. And the Portuguese Province, the first erected in the Society, was the most important for the early expansion of the Society's work into the missions. Much of the early history of the Society is found in Portuguese documents. For this reason the *Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu*, the central historical review of the Society in Rome, publishes articles in Portuguese.¹ It may be interesting, then, to give a short digest of the history of the Society in Portugal, for that history is to a large extent the history of Portugal itself.

The task is rendered easy by the excellent history of Portuguese Jesuits by Francisco Rodrigues, S. J., now in course of publication.² It carries the history of the Portuguese Assistancy³ up to the year 1615. This work is part of the great plan launched by Father General Luis Martín, with the aid of Cardinal Ehrle. The plan called for the writing of Jesuit history according to assistencies.⁴ The two tomes of Rodrigues worthily take their place beside those of Duhr, Astrain, Tacchi Venturi, Hughes, Fouqueray and Zalenski. So vast, in fact, was the Portuguese field of action that the history of the Society in Brazil is being written separately. So far two volumes have been published.⁵ The history of Rodrigues is little known among English readers. No review of it has appeared in English. Yet it is important. It corrects and in places supplements statements in Astrain's History of the Society of Jesus in the Spanish Assistancy, which hitherto has been an important source for recent works touching on Portugal.

In 1539 John III of Portugal, desirous of sending missionaries to evangelize his vast possessions, asked Paul III for members of the little band of Jesuits under Ignatius of Loyola. The following year, 1540, Ignatius sent Francis Xavier and Simon Rodriguez to Lisbon, whence they were to sail for the Orient. Only Xavier sailed. Rodriguez was kept in Lisbon by the king, who

wished him to exercise his zeal in Portugal. Rodriguez established the Portuguese Province and became its first provincial. He remained in this office for twelve years. However, he did not possess all the qualities necessary for such an office in those pioneering days. Great dissension arose among the members of the province. A Visitor was sent by Ignatius. Rodriguez was recalled to Rome, where he was severely punished. Much has been written about Rodriguez' responsibility in all this. Francisco Rodrigues goes into the question very thoroughly and judges Simon Rodriguez favorably.⁶ He rejects Astrain's very unfavorable opinion,⁷ which has been generally accepted by other historians.⁸ Nevertheless, Francisco Rodrigues has had its critics. Del Portillo,⁹ and Dudon¹⁰ disagree with him. But he has the facts, and on questions of importance is to be preferred to Astrain. Thus Astrain states that about half of the Portuguese Province, i.e. around 130 members, were either expelled or left of their own accord in 1552.¹¹ Rodrigues points out¹² that Astrain has been followed in this fact by Karrer,¹³ Pollen,¹⁴ and Campbell.¹⁵ To these names can be added Brucker,¹⁶ Pastor,¹⁷ Van Dyke,¹⁸ Koch,¹⁹ Yeo,²⁰ and the compiler of *Synopsis Historiae Societatis Iesu*.²¹ Rodrigues points out that Astrain made a mistake in interpreting the letter written to Rome by the Visitor, Miguel de Torres, and from hitherto unedited documents he shows conclusively that the number of those who left the province in that year was thirty-three.²²

The mission work of the Portuguese Assistancy initiated by Xavier is one of the glories of the Church and of Portugal. The Far East—India, the Moluccas, Japan, and later China—was evangelized. Japan had its first resident bishop in 1598. As the missions grew in numbers they became provinces in the Portuguese Assistancy. India became a province in 1549, and then in 1610 was divided into the Provinces of Goa and of Malabar. Japan became a province in 1612, and China a vice-province in 1618.²³ In Africa Jesuits were sent to the Congo in 1547. Portuguese Jesuits founded missions in Angola and Guinea and penetrated into Ethiopia, where in the beginning of the seventeenth century union with Rome was effected. In the New World the first Jesuit missionaries were sent to Brazil in 1549 with Manuel de Nóbrega as superior. Up to 1615 twenty-eight expeditions were made to that country.

¹ *Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu*, I (1932), 4

² *História da Companhia de Jesus na Assistência de Portugal*. Oporto. 1931 and 1938

³ The Province was erected in 1546, the Assistancy in 1558. The Assistancy included the Provinces of Portugal, India and Brazil. Later on other provinces were established. Cf. *Synopsis Historiae Societatis Iesu* (Ratisbonne, 1914), 586, 587

⁴ Gilbert J. Garraghan, S. J., "Franz Cardinal Ehrle", *The Ecclesiastical Review*, 94 (Feb., 1936), 139, 140

⁵ Serafim Leite, S. J., *História da Companhia de Jesus no Brasil*, Lisbon and Rio de Janeiro, 2 vols., 1938

⁶ Rodrigues, *op. cit.*, I, 2, 145-154, 262-281

⁷ Antonio Astrain, S. J., *Historia de la Compañía de Jesús en la Asistencia de España*, I, 585-637

⁸ Rodrigues, *op. cit.*, 280, mentions Brou, *St. François Xavier* (Paris, 1922), II, 307-310; Rosa, *I Gesuiti dalle Origini ai nostri Giorni* (Rome, 1929), 139-141; Campbell, *The Jesuits 1534-1921* (New York, 1921), 91-93

⁹ *Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu*, I (1932), 316

¹⁰ *Saint Ignace de Loyola* (Paris, 1934), 465, note 1

¹¹ Astrain, *op. cit.*, 608

¹² Rodrigues, *op. cit.*, 139, note 1

¹³ *Der heilige Franz von Borja* (Freiburg, 1921), 128

¹⁴ *Saint Ignatius of Loyola* (New York, 1922), 77

¹⁵ *Op. cit.*, 93

¹⁶ *La Compagnie de Jésus* (Paris, 1919), 119

¹⁷ *The History of the Popes*, XIII (St. Louis, 1924), 192

¹⁸ *Ignatius Loyola* (New York, 1926), 234

¹⁹ *Jesuiten-Lexikon* (Paderborn, 1934), 1456

²⁰ *The Greatest of the Borgias* (London, 1936), 182

²¹ Col. 22

²² Rodrigues, *op. cit.*, 139-141

²³ *Synopsis Historiae Societatis Iesu*, 586

The educational work of the Portuguese Jesuits was important even in the early years of the province. In 1559 the University of Evora was founded by the Cardinal-Infante, Henry, and its direction and administration were given to the Society. All branches of learning could be taught there except medicine, civil law and a part of canon law. The university could confer academic degrees. It was at Evora that Luis de Molina taught theology for fifteen years, from 1568 to 1584. He then devoted himself exclusively to preparing his works for publication. The most famous of these was his *Concordia*, published in 1589. At Coimbra in 1555 John III entrusted to the Society the College of Arts, which he had founded eight years before. It formed an integral part of the University of Coimbra. From 1592 to 1606 were published the five large volumes of lectures in philosophy given at the college. The work is well known as the *Coimbricenses*. When the University requested a lecturer in theology Francisco Suárez, "Doctor Eximius" was appointed. He held a chair of theology there from 1597 to 1617. Smaller colleges were opened at Oporto, Braga, Braganza and in the Azores.

At court the Jesuits exercised no small influence over the members of the royal family. Miguel de Torres was the confessor of Queen Catherine. Luís Gonçalves da Câmara was the confessor of Prince John. Dom Sebastian was trained from his early years by the Jesuits. According to the will of John III Father Luís Gonçalves da Câmara was selected by the queen and the Cardinal-Infante for the literary and moral formation of Dom Sebastian, the future king. Luís Gonçalves entered on his task in 1560, when Dom Sebastian was but a child of six years. The close proximity of Luís Gonçalves to Dom Sebastian exasperated many, among them the queen. All attempts, however, by his enemies to have the Jesuit father removed failed by reason of the strong attachment Sebastian felt for his guide and confessor. Luís Gonçalves, himself, tried several times to leave the court, but it was only in 1574 that he obtained his wish. A letter written by him on that occasion to the General of the Society and published now for the first time²⁴ shows that he had had no ambitions in staying at court and that he had remained there only for reasons of obedience.

One of the most serious accusations made against Father Luís Gonçalves da Câmara was that through his influence he dissuaded Sebastian from contracting marriage. During twenty years, from 1559-1578, efforts were made to find a suitable spouse for Sebastian in the courts of Europe. Marguerite de Valois, sister of Charles IX of France; Isabel of Austria, daughter of the King of Bohemia; the daughter of the Duke of Bavaria; the Infanta Doña Isabel, daughter of Philip II; the daughter of the Grand Duke of Florence, were all proposed. But all in vain! Before any marriage could be contracted, the king perished in 1578 with his army at Al Kasr al Kebir. This was a great national disaster for Portugal, not only because of the destruction of the army, but because the king left no heir to succeed him. Marriages had been arranged, but had fallen through without any fault on the part of Sebastian. In fact, he had showed himself willing to enter into matrimony.

There is no proof that Gonçalves da Câmara interfered. If there were any marriage to which he could as confessor and spiritual guide of the king have objected, it was that with Marguerite de Valois, the rather loose-living daughter of Catherine de' Medici. Rumors went through Europe and reached Rome that Luís Gonçalves was actually hindering the marriage. Pius V not being well informed about the virtues of Marguerite was in favor of the marriage. Francis Borgia, the General of the Society, wrote to Luís Gonçalves asking him to do all in his power to promote the marriage. The letter written in reply by Luís Gonçalves to Borgia and now published in its entirety²⁵ shows how much Luís Gonçalves had worked to promote the marriage. This letter should once and for all put an end to the accusation that the Jesuit confessor did everything in his power to prevent the king from marrying and thus paved the way for the loss of national independence.

As a matter of fact, if Gonçalves had lived longer he might have prevented the disaster at Al Kasr al Kebir. Sebastian set out the first time for Africa in 1574. Gonçalves, who had retired from the court at the beginning of that year, wrote to the king entreating him to return to the kingdom and console his subjects who were distressed at the dangers to which the king exposed himself. Sebastian was moved on reading the letter and returned to Portugal. Gonçalves unfortunately died the following year. With him disappeared an important obstacle to the warlike designs of Sebastian. The young king finally sailed for Africa in June, 1578, to meet his death. It is interesting to note in passing that fifteen Jesuits accompanied the expedition to look after the spiritual and corporal needs of the soldiers.

The Cardinal, Henry, the grand-uncle of Sebastian, ascended the throne, an old man of sixty-seven years. He reigned only eighteen months. The great question during his reign was that of the succession to the throne. The cardinal was entreated by clergy, nobility and people to obtain a dispensation from the Holy See to marry and thus provide an heir for the throne. Rome, however, would not give the dispensation.

There were three main claimants to the throne. Two were Portuguese, the Duke of Braganza and Antonio, Prior of Crato. The third was Philip II of Spain, who had a large army to enforce his claim. The Jesuits were in a delicate position. The Cardinal King was attached to the Society and during nine years had had a Jesuit confessor, Father Leão Henriques. When Dom Henry became king, the General of the Society, Everard Mercurian, wrote to him asking him not to employ his confessor in affairs foreign to the Institute of the Society. The king acceded to this request and forbade his confessor to take any part in the controversy centering around the claimants. Henriques observed this injunction loyally. And the Portuguese Province on the whole maintained a prudent attitude during those troubled months, although it can be said that the fathers were generally sympathetic to the claims of the Duke of Braganza.

With the death of the king in January, 1580, and the seizure of the throne by Philip II, the influence of the

²⁴ Rodrigues, *op. cit.*, II, 2, 281, 282

²⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 331-335

Portuguese Jesuits abated. They maintained a respectful attitude towards Philip, an attitude dictated not by love, but by prudence and even fear. They no longer had access to the court, where their influence had been so great with the Portuguese kings.

We look forward to succeeding volumes to continue the fascinating story of the Jesuits in Portugal. After the resurrection of Portugal through the House of Braganza in 1640 Jesuits again played a prominent part in the history of their country, both in Portugal and in the Portuguese dominions. In 1749 the Portuguese Assistancy numbered 1754 members, of whom 972 were priests. There were 861 men in Portugal itself, 303 in the Far East, including 57 in the Japanese and 49 in the Chinese missions, and 590 were in Brazil.²⁶ With the advent to power of Carvalho, the Marquis of Pombal, dark days began for the Society, and finally the Jesuits were driven out of Portugal in 1759.

In the nineteenth century, in 1829, French Jesuits began again the work of the Society in Portugal. After

²⁶ Koch, *op. cit.*, 1458

a few years, however, they were banished. It was only twenty years later that permanent work could begin. With natives of Portugal applying for admission a novitiate was opened in 1860. In 1880 an independent Portuguese province was erected. The Revolution of 1910 brought disaster. The Jesuits were exiled and their possessions confiscated. In recent years there has been a decided turn for the better. The new Constitution of 1933 provides legal recognition of religious congregations.²⁷ Now that the Society has a legal status and can exist in peace, it is making progress. The province numbers 375 members, with missions in Goa and Macao. In 1938 its mission in Brazil was erected into an independent vice-province. Now in 1940 the Portuguese Province can look back on a glorious past, one of splendid achievement for both the Church and Portugal, a past also of no little suffering. It can look forward to a future of great hopes.

²⁷ Charles Chesnelong, "Le Portugal d'Aujourd'hui," *Etudes*, 236 (1938) 177, 178; *Arquivo da Provincia Portuguesa*, I (May, 1939) 107-110

The General of the Suppressed Jesuits

Peter M. Dunne, S. J., Ph. D.

University of San Francisco

IN THE *Biblioteca Pública* of Guadalajara in Mexico, and specifically in the *sección de manuscritos*, lies a long-forgotten copy of a funeral oration* preached on the occasion of the death of Father Lorenzo Ricci, the eighteenth general of the Society of Jesus, and the last before its suppression. The oration was delivered, not in Mexico, or in Spain, but in Breslau, the capital of Silesia, almost three years after the official suppression by the brief *Dominus ac Redemptor* of Pope Clement XIV, issued August 18, 1773.

Ricci died a prisoner in the Castel Sant' Angelo, November 24, 1775. The oration was delivered by an unidentified Jesuit to commemorate the sad event. It could not have been delivered with official approval anywhere outside of Prussia and Russia. Silesia in 1741 had been taken by Frederick II, detached from the Austrian Hapsburgs and incorporated into Prussia. Now it is well known that both Frederick II of Prussia and Catherine II of Russia did not allow the brief of suppression to be promulgated in their dominions. It was legitimate, therefore, according to canon law, for the Jesuits to continue their work in these countries. The Jesuits had a house in Breslau, and Frederick II, in September 27, 1775, wrote to its superior assuring him that the new Pontiff, Pius VI, approved their continued existence in Prussia. It was early in 1776, not many months after the reception of this letter, that the funeral oration was delivered in Breslau, probably by the Jesuit superior himself. From German the oration was translated into Italian and from Italian turned into Spanish. It fills thirty-seven folio pages.

This piece of oratory is interesting not only because of its style and organization, which are highly dramatic

after the finest classical manner of the late renaissance, but also because it reflects the thoughts and feelings of a prominent Jesuit in Germany, three years after the suppression of his order.

The text was chosen from the Book of Wisdom, X, 12 (Vulgate edition): Wisdom "gave him a strong conflict, that he might overcome, and know that wisdom is mightier than all." The orator begins with the Christian virtues which Ricci exhibited during the trials and sufferings as General of the Jesuits. He dwells upon the calamity of the suppression, and finally he reflects, in high-flown rhetoric, on the accusations brought against his order. He closes with flattering phrases and encomiums directed towards the Jesuits' friend and protector in Prussia, Frederick II, whom he calls "the glory of our age, the philosopher prince, . . . invincible sovereign, who to the glory of the Aurelians and the Antonines adds also that of the Augustuses and the Caesars." Interjections in this peroration aid the expression of the speaker's grateful emotion.

From the earlier passages we, the modern readers, can gain a close-up view of the spirit in which the fathers accepted the fatal blow of the extinction of their order. After praising the submissiveness and Christian humility of Ricci, the orator reflects on the necessity of the manifestation of these same virtues by the General's former sons in their hour of trial. And, continues the father, "Had hatred been allowed to dwell among us, then the pernicious roots of a malignant plant would have remained in our midst." These earlier passages bear witness likewise to the fine religious spirit which prevailed among the Jesuits, for the orator is grateful to God that there still dwells among his brethren the old spirit "of obedience, . . . of union among themselves, . . . of zeal for the salvation of souls." Well might he have spoken thus, for, though he may not have known it, the Jesuits

* This manuscript was photographed in microfilm in Guadalajara and given to the writer by Dr. Theodore E. Treutlein of San Francisco State College.

in Russia were on the threshold of launching a magnificently successful mission work, commanded by Catherine II, among the degraded peoples of the lower Volga, and farther southeast among the Kalmuks and Mahometans of Kazan, Astrakhan, and the coasts of the Caspian Sea.

In this first part, having to do with Ricci's virtues and sufferings, the speaker is always conscious of the accusations against his order. After describing the spirit with which the Jesuits, with their General, bore the blow of suppression, the orator adds:

Come, likewise you defamers of the Jesuits, come and see the zeal which inflamed our brothers . . . in order that the trumpet of the Gospel might resound in the remotest portion of the globe. Did they go for riches or power, for ostentation or vainglory? They carried on commerce in China, but was it with a merchant's wares, and was it with these that Christianity was introduced into that empire? They did business in Japan, in the land of the Mogul, in Persia, but they gave their blood in exchange for the salvation of many souls. In America too they trafficked, but their wares were charity and kindness, and they banished atrocity and horror. . . .

One who has just a little knowledge of the Jesuit missions, whether in the Americas or elsewhere, knows that the above passage, though oratorical in form, is no oratorical exaggeration. Nor is the following, which comes five pages later:

Ricci goes to his reward, but we, scattered throughout the world in beggarly poverty, deprived of all we possessed, we have everywhere repaid persecution with the olive branch of conciliation. But our offer of peace was taken and changed into a clamor for our destruction. The nobility forgot the education we had given them; the erudite doctors did not remember that among us they took in the first rudiments of science. The colonials have not kept in mind our fruitful missions, but, even to the lowest stratum of the people, formerly accustomed to respect and revere us, they now despise us and treat us insultingly.

It is interesting as well as edifying to note here that the modern Jesuit has shown himself equal to his ancient confrère in a Christlike spirit of suffering and desire for peace. In the general congregation of the Society of Jesus, held in Rome in the spring of 1938, when it was proposed to publish the documents relating to the suppression of the society (which documents spell the exculpation of the order), a strong group urged that these be not published, so that the Society of Jesus might suffer in silence, misunderstood, in imitation of Jesus Christ whose name it bears.

Our eighteenth-century Jesuit orator is naïve, however, in referring to the colonials' attitude towards the fruitful missions, for in Mexico as in Paraguay, many a colonial looked with envious eye upon the "fruitful mission", desiring to have it for himself.

In dwelling on the calamities of the suppression, the orator delivers himself of some touching passages. Formerly, says he, if our men were persecuted, calumniated, they rejoiced in this; and they enjoyed, notwithstanding, the esteem even of corrupt men and the favors of the Church and of the Popes. "But, O God, to what terrible days has Your providence assigned us, what tribulations have crowded upon our shoulders, and what an enormous weight has let itself down upon the neck of poor Ricci!" In imitation of Cicero's *Pro Milone*, where the ancient orator in his peroration makes Milo apostrophize the citizens of Rome, our orator of the eighteenth century puts touching words into Ricci's mouth as he addresses his sons of the Jesuit Order:

The one consolation we can have is our service to our country and our sovereigns. And if to them we have seemed guilty, not to our own consciences have we seemed so; and God has allowed these trials, permitting that credence be given to these suspicions which have taken us from your side. But nought which is in hearts will be hidden and in that dread day of judgment to each will come the retribution for his deeds. We have been accorded the gift of the teachings of that tender mother [he means the Society of Jesus] of whom we have been the sons. Always in our memory we shall hold the thought of the favors with which she has distinguished us even to the present hour; and only in God, who accounts for His providence to no man, shall we find the secret causes of what has happened.

Though nowhere is the Pope criticized, secular princes come in for a share of remonstrance:

O Catholic princes, vicars of the divine majesty, you err in the sight of the highest angels in removing from your presence the protectors not only of your precious lives, but likewise of the wisdom of your councils. To have beheld our comrades expelled through a cruel exile forever from their fatherland cannot but dull the gratitude with which we recall past favors. It does not increase our gratitude to see them covered with opprobrium in strange lands of alien tongue, nor to see our churches, in which we worshipped God, despoiled of their ornaments, and the income for their support turned into secular channels. . . .

When our orator comes to what seems to be his third division, the consideration of the false accusations against the Society, he launches forth, now in tender pathos, now in withering irony.

We are assassins of kings, we have been the disturbers of the public peace; Ricci in allowing these crimes became the disturber of the peace of Europe. . . . Take from us everything we have, all tranquillity and comfort of mind, exile us, destroy us, but do not disturb by such clamors the ashes of those who sleep. Do not hand down to your posterity so abominable an imputation. To keep the peace of Europe, of the Church, let the Society, if need be, perish.

There are other fine passages. There is mention of the precipitous descent of Ricci from the honored headship of a religious order to the depths of a wretched prison; there is the reflection that from the prison's gloomy walls he had caught a higher vision, and that at his death he carried with him the consciousness of innocence, the right judgment of good men, and understanding on the part of God. Then the orator swings into touching accents of pathos which are not diminished when he mingles with them the acidity of sarcasm:

You have departed, dear and loving father, you have departed, and as you take your place in Heaven the multitude of your sons will ask blessings upon you, sons who are desolate, but who will keep ever green and fresh the memory of you. . . . Though we [the Jesuits] are gone may Italy be blessed and may all of Catholic Europe be made more happy; . . . may the youth be educated in colleges; may the people be nourished with the sacraments and with their daily spiritual bread, with doctrine to defend the Church against the attacks and insults of her enemies; may the distress of others be lightened through the healing of dissension; . . . we shall rest in the infinite store of divine merits, and in faith we shall resign ourselves to the dispositions of that Judge Who has deprived us of the opportunity of continuing His work. May others have the opportunity of enduring such great fatigue; of doing what we did not do. . . . Now no longer exists Ricci to change and govern the world at his caprice; now no longer exist his sons to corrupt the dogma of the Church. . . . May the world be reformed upon the ruin of the Jesuits, manners sanctified, religion augmented, and Holy Church exalted. To the universal chorus of gratitude we add our own, for though the banners of Ignatius be abandoned and fall forever, never can a Christian heart, moved by a transcendent purpose, come unto frustration.

Then comes the closing of the peroration and the apostrophe to Frederick the Great, which we have quoted in part above:

O, glory of our age, the philosopher prince, to whom we owe this opportunity of the innocent to ease our pent-up sorrow over the ashes of our father. . . . What can we do in gratitude for so signal a favor. Always we can be respectful vassals, useful helpers, zealous ministers. . . . To this our own interest urges

us in order that a tardy posterity, impartial judge of that which we do in your kingdom, obliterate the black mark which has made so terrible our fall.

Appended to the manuscript copy of this funeral oration is the account of Ricci's death copied from the *Gaceta Italiana*, Rome, November 25, 1775. The account reads: Last night after a long agony died the Signor Abbate Ricci at seventy-two years of age. He had been eighteenth general of the Society of Jesus. During his long imprisonment in the Castel Sant' Angelo he never enjoyed good health. He was buried from the church of St. John the Baptist of the Florentines and was honored with a funeral in keeping with the nobility of his family and his state in religion. It was said in this city that after he received the holy viaticum he made the following protestation: that although he acknowledges himself before God and man to be guilty of many faults and defects, nevertheless, neither he nor his order have been guilty of the things for which they stand so afflicted. He protested and put himself as witness before Jesus Christ in the Blessed Sacrament, which he was about to receive, that he was most innocent; that he pardons with all his heart anyone who has been the cause or occasion of the great affliction which the Society of Jesus suffered in that time. But he submits to the decrees of the Holy See which have imprisoned him. For [the Pope] he stands ready to sacrifice all—his heart, his blood, his life; during all his days and in all his sufferings, he had been his devoted son in Jesus Christ.

Before his death the Signor Ricci sent to beg the blessing of the Holy Father *in articulo mortis*. A great concourse of people of all grades came to view the corpse. In the evening on the morrow of his death about seven o'clock the Signor Abbate Ricci was taken in a carriage from the church of St. John of the Florentines to the Gesu or Professed House, accompanied by an official of the Castel Sant' Angelo, preceded and followed by carriages, in which were the curate and vice-curate, and the notary to identify the corpse. This was placed in a coffin and buried in the sepulchre of the generals of the suppressed order.

England's Immunity from Attack

John B. Connorton, M. A.

Fordham University

GERMAN troops have taken the Channel ports, and Antwerp, the "pistol cocked at the heart of England" is now in Hitler's hands. All the world waits to see when and where the grey clad invaders will attempt to cross the Channel, for many years England's last and best line of defence. Newspapers talk glibly of the centuries-long impregnability of English shores, as if, in the grim horrors of German aerial attacks, England faces her first invasion since the days of William the Conqueror. As a matter of fact the history of England from 1066 up to the 17th century shows at least a half a dozen successful major invasions and several other minor or unsuccessful ventures. Interesting, too, is the fact that the Fifth Column, which so many people regard as the peculiar contribution of this war, played an important role in the past.

Twelfth Century

When Henry I, the second son to succeed William of Normandy, died in 1135, he left no male heir, and civil war followed between his daughter, Matilda, who had married Geoffrey of Anjou, and his favorite nephew, Stephen of Blois. Though all the English nobles had agreed to recognize Matilda, Stephen crossed over to England, seized London and the treasury at Winchester, and was crowned King within three weeks after Henry's death. Incidentally, Stephen had a Fifth Column working for him, since his brother, Henry, Bishop of Winchester, had many friends in England anxious to further his cause and their own. Matilda came over from the

continent in 1138 with her followers from Anjou, and for the next ten years civil war raged in England until she was driven out.

In 1149 young Henry of Anjou, Matilda's son, invaded England to maintain his mother's claim, but was not too successful, and went home. Returning in 1153 he waged so successful a campaign against Stephen that the Treaty of Wallingford put an end to the wars, and recognized Henry's claims to the English throne when Stephen died. Thus, the invader Henry of Anjou became Henry II in 1154, and this man who spoke French as did most of the nobility, and who spent half of his time in his possessions in France, turned out to be one of England's greatest kings.

Thirteenth Century

The reign of King John, marked by conflicts with the Papacy and his own barons, saw the invasion in May, 1216, of Louis, son of Philip Augustus of France. Having prepared a large fleet to cross over with an army of 1200 knights and a large force of infantry, Louis captured London and received an enthusiastic welcome from many English who detested the loose living and tyranny of John. From June to October the French were in full possession of most of southeastern England, but then the Fifth Column of English nobles became disillusioned and turned on the invaders, who signed a peace treaty after some bad defeats and went home.

The England of Henry III, John's son and successor, had to face no armed invasion, but there were many bitter critics of the peaceful infiltration of the Poitevin friends of Peter des Roches, the tutor who dominated the boy king. Peter des Roches lost out politically in 1234, but in 1236 Henry married Eleanor of Provence, and another influx of foreign job-seekers and parasites flooded England. These peaceful foreign invasions added greatly to the unpopularity of Henry III, and led to the revolt of the barons under Simon de Montfort, who curiously enough was a foreigner himself.

In 1295 while Edward I, the English Justinian, was having difficulties with France, Matthew of Montmorency led a fleet into Dover and sacked and burnt the town. Though this scheme to invade England failed quickly, it marked the beginnings under Philip IV of the French navy, which was to harass England for centuries to come.

Fourteenth Century

During the unhappy Edward II's reign his estranged wife, Queen Isabella, and her paramour, Roger Mortimer, invaded England in 1326 with mercenaries from Hainault and Holland. Landing at Orwell, they were joined by men of Suffolk and Essex, which minimized the importance of the foreigners. The invasion was successful; the hated Despencers, favorites of the King and opponents of the Queen, were executed; Edward was captured and finally murdered in a horrible fashion in 1327.

Norman fleets attacked England in 1340 while Edward III was ruling, but though they burned Southampton not much else was achieved. Shortly after the English won a smashing naval victory at Sluys. This put an end to the threat of invasion, and helped them carry the war to France. Yet under Richard II English ships suffered badly for they had lost control of the sea. King Enrique of Castile had allied himself with the French, and so in

1377 the French admiral Jean de Vienne and his Castilian colleague Ferran Sanchez de Tovar raided Kent and Sussex. They sacked Rye, the Isle of Wight, burnt Hastings, and even raided Gravesend. In 1385 the French sent 1,000 men to Scotland, and together with the Scots they raided the northern countries of England. When Richard went north with his army the Scots retired, destroyed all possible sources of food and adopted guerilla tactics. The French, who wanted to fight face to face, were enraged when the experienced Scots retired, leaving them no other choice. They were further disgusted when, after they had been fighting in the Scots' cause for weeks, they were presented with a bill for board and lodging. Needless to say, they returned to France much wiser than they had come. In this same year, 1385, Richard made extensive defence preparations for another French invasion in the south though this never materialized. The tremendous expense involved weakened Richard's position at home, and thus had important political effects.

Some years later Richard was away in Ireland, when his great rival, Henry Bolingbroke, son of John of Gaunt, landed at Ravenspur on the Humber on July 4, 1399 with only 100 men. This invasion spelled the ruin of Richard, for the once exiled Lancastrian was soon joined by his Fifth Column of English supporters, and within a few months the king was deposed. The invader became Henry IV, beginning the "Lancastrian experiment", and Richard met a foul death shortly after.

Fifteenth Century

Owen Glendower headed a revolt in Wales during Henry IV's reign. In 1405 he received aid from France in shape of 800 men-at-arms and 1800 infantry under the marshal Jean de Rieux and Jean de Hangest, master of the crossbows. Reaching Milford Haven in August, they sacked Haverfordwest, and were besieging Tenby when Lord Berkeley's squadron attacked and destroyed their ships. The French fled to shore, joined Glendower, and marched into Glamorganshire, ravaging as they went. Though Henry went over to check them, Glendower would not engage in direct combat, and so the French men-at-arms left for home in November, to be followed in the spring by their infantry.

In August, 1457, during the reign of the unfortunate Henry VI Pierre de Brézé, seneschal of Normandy, sent a fleet of 60 ships which sacked Sandwich, and burnt Fowey. Though they sailed home soon after, the utter lack of defence so upset England that the Council, dominated by Lancastrians, called on the Earl of Warwick, a staunch Yorkist, to defend the seas. He did so splendidly, much to the displeasure of Queen Margaret, the leader of the Lancastrian government, and England was safe for a time. There was however no alternative; they had to give Warwick the position of power just as in our owntime Chamberlain was forced to bring in Churchill, and the anti-clerical French government had to call on the Catholic Weygand.

The War of the Roses saw several invasions and counter-invasions by the different factions. True, they were led by Englishmen, but the presence of foreign mercenaries makes them real invasions, and proves that England was open to invasion much more than is com-

monly supposed. After the Rout of Ludlow in 1459, where the Yorkist army disintegrated and the leaders had to flee for their lives, Warwick with the Earl of March, the future King Edward IV, fled to Calais. In the following June, however, Warwick, sending an advance guard to take Sandwich, returned with 2000 men. Another Fifth Column of his friends in Kent rose up to join him, and London opened its gates to him. A few days later at Northampton he defeated the Lancastrians, captured Henry VI, and was now master of the realm. The fortunes in these wars varied so quickly there is no need to follow them in detail. Suffice it to say the son of Richard of York was crowned King Edward IV on June 28, 1461, though Henry VI was still alive, a fugitive in Scotland. Queen Margaret who had fled to France for aid returned with some 800 mercenaries in July, 1462 only to be driven off by Warwick.

But as the years passed domestic difficulties cropped up between Edward IV and Warwick, the King Maker, who fled to Calais. While Edward was busy with a revolt stirred up in the north by Warwick's Fifth Column, Warwick invaded England in June, 1469, took London unopposed after receiving much domestic support en route, went north and captured Edward, who submitted for the time being. But the very next year Edward, supported by Warwick's rivals, drove him out of the country once again to France. Here the wily King Spider, Louis XI, brought Warwick, the chief Yorkist of old days, into alliance with his dearest Lancastrian enemy, Queen Margaret, wife of Henry VI, the deposed king of England. At home, meanwhile, the secret agents of both Warwick and Queen Margaret were working against the seemingly unsuspecting Edward. Thus, when Warwick returned to England in 1470 Edward found his troops turning traitor and going over to the enemy. The Fifth Column had done its work well.

Edward fled to Holland, collected a small force of mercenaries, and sailed back in March, 1471 confident that his friends in England would help him. Landing at Ravenspur, he marched south, captured London, and at the Battle of Barnet, April 14, 1471 defeated Warwick, who was slain. Another battle over in the west at Tewkesbury saw the rest of the Lancastrian forces defeated, and as soon as Edward arrived back in London he had Henry VI murdered. Thus, the usurper was safe for the rest of his very unworthy life.

Another invasion connected with the Wars of the Roses occurred when Henry Tudor, who had fled to Brittany and thence to France after the defeat at Tewkesbury, set out with 1800 French mercenaries on Aug. 1, 1485 and landed in Wales to avoid immediate detection. Getting support from the old Lancastrians and enemies of Edward's successor, the notorious Richard III, he went on to Bosworth where he defeated Richard on Aug. 22, 1485 to become Henry VII, first of the Tudors. Henry had a few invasions to deal with also. On June 4, 1487 2000 German mercenaries, plus many Irish, landed in Lancashire under Sir Thomas Fitzgerald to press the claims of the pretender Lambert Simnel, who had been crowned as Edward VI by the Yorkists in Ireland. Henry VII defeated them at Stoke June 16, 1487, and Simnel ended his career working in the king's

kitchen. Some years later another pretender to the throne, Perkin Warbeck, who claimed to be Richard of York, second son of Edward IV, invaded England with a great force, but was driven off by the men of Kent, July 3, 1495. Two years later he returned, but was finally defeated, captured, and sent to the block.

Sixteenth Century

In 1545 Henry VIII had the unwelcome experience of watching the French collect 235 ships to attack him. In the meantime he spared no effort or expense in strengthening his coast defences, and collecting a fleet of his own. A modern note is seen in the removal of all beacons and signals which might guide the enemy up the Thames. But in July the French fleet failed to take Portsmouth harbor, and after another skirmish with an English fleet in August, it broke up shortly after, its crews decimated by plague. Thus, another invasion of England failed to achieve its purpose.

There is no need to stress the Spanish Armada of 1588, and its eventual failure. Yet the comment of the Venetian ambassador at Madrid at that time gives much chance for reflection on modern England: "The Englishmen are of a different quality from the Spaniards, bearing a name above all the West for being expert and enterprising in all maritime affairs, and the finest fighters

upon the sea . . . They have no fear that their enemy will be able to come near the English shores." This same comment could have been made about England up to the second phase of the Great War which has been destroying Europe since 1914. But now the air armadas of 1940 hold a new kind of threat against which the tradition of the sea avails nothing. Yet the lessons of history tell us that many other attempted invasions of England were driven off in the face of desperate odds, and though raiding parties sacked the coasts foreign armies could seldom hold their gains. Our own American privateers reached England's shores, and Napoleon's dreams of conquering it were as majestic as Hitler's ever could be, but England kept the moat. The invasions that did succeed were made possible by Fifth Column activities, and modern England seems to have taken care of these.

The axiom that invasions are successful more because of weakness of the invaded than the strength of the attacker held good in olden times, and will be the explanation if modern Britain falls. Britain could be far stronger than Germany in all the modern instruments of war today if it had not been for recent inefficiency. Whatever the eventual outcome of the threatened invasion of England, the myth that England has been impregnable since 1066 should be discarded.

Philosophy of History

(Continued from page 4)

made rapid headway in the exploration of the physical world and in all the sciences that touch on the material, cultural and social life of man. Great discoveries have been made, and new theories have been conceived to explain origins, processes and goals. Biology has formulated "laws" of life; anthropology, "laws" of human growth; ethnology and sociology, "laws" of social behavior; human geography formulated "laws" of the physical world's influence upon culture; and so did every other science draw up its own "laws",—all of them generalizing on the basic forces and goals of history with unrestrained freedom.

They formulated "laws of Progress", so-called, which, for the most part, are inspired by a materialistic theory of the world, exclude a Creator and intelligent design, eliminate final causes, and, what is of special relevance here, interpret history on the basis of these "laws" and theories. The result has been that, in the schools generally, the historical process has come to be understood as one vast, evolutionary unfolding of material forces governed by no intelligent power higher than themselves, and carried forward, not by the activity of free agents, but by the impulse of blind forces working mechanically by a determinism of one kind or another.

Against the welter of so much evolutionistic speculation, the old exponents of a Christian philosophy of history such as St. Augustine, Otto of Freising, Bossuet, or Friedrich von Schlegel, can render but limited, though still important service in the present situation. They do, indeed, valiantly vindicate the part Divine Providence plays in history, not only through the civilizing influence of the Church, but also through the agency of secondary physical and spiritual causes. But earthly secondary

causes they do not treat with the detail, analysis and concreteness of factual knowledge which present scientific preoccupations and interests demand. They did, to be sure, meet the questions and challenges their contemporaries flung at them,—St. Augustine did so in masterly fashion. But among these contemporary "isms" of theirs there was neither evolutionism in any of its modern forms, nor racial, economic, and geographic determinism, nor positivism, nor evolutionary idealism. These have become our peculiar problem. They present us with unquestionable facts verified by scientific observation; and yet, just as often as not, these facts are hitched to the wild horse of some theory of man and of the universe, or to some formula of "laws" which leaves origins unexplained, goals undefined, and processes misconstrued.

In view of all this, a comprehensive reformulation of an objective philosophy of history is the need of the hour, particularly now that history and the social studies have attained preeminence among the sciences.

Scholastic Philosophy

Fundamentally, of course, the fallacies of materialistic and idealistic philosophy, which are at the bottom of all invalid interpretations of history, find their refutation in every manual of scholastic philosophy. And so one might be tempted to say: "What is the sense bothering with a new statement of a Christian philosophy of history, since we have it already incorporated in our whole scholastic system?"

In answer to this, I may say, in the first place, that scholastic philosophy does not speak the language of history, nor of any of its kindred sciences. Moreover, its generally deductive method finds no great favor with one accustomed to the empiric and a *posteriori* procedure

of the historian, anthropologist, ethnologist, or student of cultures. The philosophy with which we are here concerned being a philosophy of *history*, must first move among the facts of history and never lose sight of them while it rises to a higher vantage ground in order to determine their long perspective and larger meaning. It is not man in the abstract with which a philosophy of history has to deal, but with definite individuals and groups as they move from one concrete historical situation to another, founding institutions, initiating movements, conceiving ideas, and doing all those particular things that make history. So much, then, for the need of a philosophy of history with a domain of its own and such as will enable us to meet modern interests and modern assumptions.

A Recent Plan

Let us now consider the lines along which such a philosophy might be formulated. These have already been laid down by a thoughtful Silesian scholar, the late Dr. Franz Sawicki, Professor in the Seminary of Posen; they were given publicity in his *Geschichtsphilosophie*,¹ a work that well deserves translation and adaptation to English-speaking students of history.² I can do no better than summarize Dr. Sawicki's plan of procedure supplementing it with suggestions of my own on two or three points.

By way of introduction, Dr. Sawicki defines the nature and scope of a philosophy of history, distinguishing it clearly from other related sciences, especially sociology, with which it might be easily confused. He then completes the introduction with a historical survey of the various conceptions of the historical process entertained by thinkers from pagan antiquity to modern times. At this preliminary stage, I would further define and clarify certain ideas that belong to the language and content of a philosophy of history. Such would be the notions of *cause* and *causality*, and particularly of *final causes* which so much dominate the march of human events. I would also point out the essential difference between *cause*, on the one hand, and *condition* and *occasion*, on the other, notions commonly jumbled in historical writing.

Dr. Sawicki, then proceeds to the body of his work wherein are examined the nature, operation, and mutual relations of the four basic elements that enter into the warp and woof of historical situations: (1) man; (2) the physical world about him; (3) the environment of culture, or cultural climate, in which every man is born and moves; and (4) God and supernatural factors.

Man enters into the process of history and plays his part therein in two capacities, as an *individual*, and as member of a group, organic or otherwise. As an individual, man has a personality, a creative free-will and a character—all of them realities whose positive influence as historical factors is to be duly assessed. Acting in the association of a group, man plays a part different from his part as an individual. Here the nature of the "group mind", the various kinds of human associations, the phenomena of group psychology, present themselves for examination and analysis; and then, the relations that

exist and are verifiable between individual action and group action. How does the one factor influence the other, and which, in ultimate analysis, is the determining one?

From the actor the philosopher of history now turns to the stage in order to take account of the influence exerted by the operations of *physical nature* in history. This includes both *exterior* nature or the physical world in the midst of which man lives, and *interior* nature or that part of the physical world which man carries with him in his physical constitution. To what extent is man's freedom of action dependent upon, or independent of, geographic and climatic conditions, or of the dispositions of human body, and according to what laws? Such would be the questions discussed here; and naturally also the theories of geographic, racial and relevant natural determinisms.

Then comes the *cultural milieu*. Every generation of men, in the run of the historical course, is born not only in the midst of a geographical habitat, but also in a circumambient medium of culture inherited from the past, made up of a context of knowledge, beliefs, laws, institutions, habits and customs, all of which taken together constitute by themselves a powerful factor exercising a determining influence upon human activity. At this juncture are properly analyzed the components of culture and their mutual relations: religion, morality, science, art, economic and practical life, the Church and State. Here, I should also suggest, is the proper place to construe a satisfactory definition of such atrociously abused notions as *civilization* and *culture* and to indict offending theories.

The most important basic factor, is the *action of the supernatural*. There is no difficulty in establishing the essential relations between God and history on the basis of Reason and Faith. The problem, however, is more difficult and delicate when we come to verify God's action in the affairs of men by the texture and course of historical events. But here, again, difficulty is not impossibility. For there are certain well authenticated events of history which are of miraculous nature, and which can show to any historian, whose mind is free from atheistic obsessions, that they are the action of a Divine Power. But besides this direct intervention of God in human affairs, there is the exercise of His Providence. To trace this, a more indirect approach must be made, both by way of induction from the evidences of finality we observe in all creatures, and by way of deduction from the nature and attributes of God.

Having established the relations between God and history, Dr. Sawicki turns to the formulation of *historical laws*. These laws must always be determined with reference to man's free will, and must further explain the relation between cause and effect, since at bottom all so-called "historical laws" are no more than the laws of man's free will, seeing that even physical and external forces, working in historical events, achieve their effect, as far as man is concerned with them, though *psychic* or *volitional causality*, i.e. they must first become *motives* of action before they can become strictly *historic*.

A systematic treatise on the philosophy of history would not be complete unless it also had something definite to

¹ Munich. Kösel and Pustet, 1923.

² Dr. Francis J. Tschann of Penn State College has already put his hand to the translation of this work, and the present writer has promised his collaboration.

say concerning the *ultimate significance and purpose of history*, both immanent (*finis operis*) and transcendental (*finis operantis*). At this point Dr. Sawicki states the problem by asking a double question: (1) Has a definite end been assigned for man to achieve in the course of history, and what is it? (2) What purpose does mankind actually pursue in its history, and what purpose does it actually attain?

Both of these questions obviously involve the idea of *progress*, and the idea of progress implies an examination into the starting point, the goal, and the way between both. This tracing of *termini* necessarily leads beyond the limits of this world's history on to other-worldly starting points and goals without consideration of which man's history remains incomplete.

Supplementing Dr. Sawicki's reflections I might remark that a Catholic philosophy of history would have little trouble in formulating a true and complete theory of Progress, aided as it is by light from above. Its task in this connection would mainly be to present that theory in the language of the day, and to apply it in the analysis

and synthesis of historical events on the basis of the above mentioned fundamental factors. How much spade work there is for the Christian philosopher of history to do when he comes to the question of Progress, any one who knows how thick and rank is the growth of wild theory on this subject in the sociological literature of the present day can well realize.

Needless to observe, the comprehensive formulation of a philosophy that deals with so vast and complex a subject as history, can scarcely be the work of one mind or of one day. The study of man is the work of many sciences. So is the study of the physical world and of culture; and so is the study of God and of the relations of the world of man and nature to Him. To coordinate and integrate all the data that bear upon and explain human activity in history as it flows from generation to generation and from age to age, and to determine at each stage whither it is leading, is a labor that is as useful as it is intricate. But the first thing is to see the need for it and make a beginning.

History in the High School

W. B. Faherty, S. J., M. A.

Campion, Prairie du Chien, Wisconsin

SOME there are who teach boys,—or girls—but are not particularly worried whether the boys are learning the causes of the Civil War, or the best way to stop a double-wing back offense. Others are intensely in earnest about teaching history, whether the *boys* get anything out of it or not; they spout historical wisdom fifty minutes a day, while the boys sleep, draw pictures or stare out the windows at the ball field, onto which the longed-for bell will soon release them. The Romans had the right idea, two accusatives, boys and history. *Doceo pueros historiam*. Both are interesting; put them together and you have a combination to thrill any teacher.

For history is of itself interesting to the average boy. Even Pope Leo XIII recognized that in a letter he wrote to the whole Church almost sixty years ago.¹ Then take the modern American boy—the subject has even greater interest for him. Whereas my classmates of twelve years ago were but slightly familiar with the names of Baldwin and Primo de Rivera, rulers respectively of England and Spain, what American boy is not familiar with the names of Churchill and Franco, their modern successors?

Modern inventions have brought distant places and foreign people into our ken; the newsreel cameras take us along the wharves of Shanghai, or show us the King of Norway exiled in England; the radio brings in Helsinki after a bombardment, or Vatican City for the words of the pope; newspapers and magazines all help to stimulate this interest.

I. Motives and Objectives

Many motives and objectives present themselves when we ask why the study of history should be taken up. Some motives will appeal directly to the boys and should be pointed out to them; some will appeal to their parents. Some objectives are to be sought in the entire group of boys; some are limited to a small group.

We gain an *appreciation of our country* when we study its history and the history of other countries. We understand the value of our institutions and the care we must exercise to keep them. We see evils arise and look in the past for possible remedies. For instance the Roman cry "Bread and circuses" has its modern counterpart in "Keep the W. P. A." An understanding of the development and working out of our and other governmental systems will lead to a more intelligent citizenship. To quote an eminent Catholic educator, "It is the firm conviction of the present writer that the lack of historical knowledge is responsible for many evils in American life".²

History puts us in close contact with the great *characters* and the weak ones of all ages. We see the good things done by good men, the evil done by evil men. We compare the prosperous reign of St. Louis IX of France with the calamitous reign of his eighteenth century successor, Louis XV. We develop new models and heroes in life, Thomas More, Lord Chancellor of England, or Catherine Tekawitha, the saintly Mohawk maiden. Not that the pupils would go home immediately to tear their pictures of Hedy Lamarr and Mickey Rooney off the wall and put up a picture of Michelangelo or Isabella the Crusader—they would have a hard time finding pictures of these people—but they would take as their heroes and heroines people who have really accomplished something, and who are really worth their admiration.

A factor not to be forgotten is that history is one of the best subjects for teaching *balanced judgment*. It

¹ "Letter of Leo XIII on History", in *Tablet*, 62 (Sept., 1882), 321. Sept. 1882, p. 321. "History has attractions for the precocious and ardent intellect of youth; the pictures offered to it of ancient times, and the images of men whom the narrative invests with renewed life, are eagerly welcomed by the young men and retained forever deeply engraven in their memories".

² William J. McGucken, S. J., *Catholic Way in Education*, 66

helps to develop a fairer attitude towards all nations and peoples. "It should teach us", Father Schrader writes, "better than any other subject how to avoid one of the most conspicuous of modern failings, the habit of jumping to a hasty and erroneous conclusion. It should teach us to distinguish propaganda from fact, furnish us with the necessary perspective for the understanding of our own time, render us capable of separating the permanent elements in contemporary life from those which are but passing and accidental."³

Some teachers forget that scarcely any subject offers greater opportunities for the practice of *reasoning* than does history. And how badly boys need this! I remember one boy in third year who admitted his inability to draw a simple conclusion from facts. He was not a dull boy; he merited the school honor roll through the strength of a good memory, gaining a rather high mark in history. How rare is the boy who can define well. You know as well as I do the great number who miss the point of a question. A boy in one of my third year classes would invariably hear the question but loquaciously answer something slightly different. I might ask, for instance, "What did Elizabeth do to the Catholics?" His answer would be something like this: "Elizabeth was queen of England, daughter of Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn; she thought she was good looking, but she was an old hag; during her reign the Spanish Armada was defeated". Another would respond in some such manner: "Well Elizabeth, a-er, queen of England, Henry VIII was king—well the pope—aw heck, I don't know!"

In English class the student is told that in defining one gives the general class and specific difference. Then, since he doesn't quite know what a "specific difference" is he defines nothing. There is the history teacher's chance. Results however will come slowly. The following is typical. "What is the Industrial Revolution?", the teacher asks. The pupil responds immediately, "The Industrial Revolution was when—". "Wait a minute", interrupts the alert pedagogue. "Is WHEN a thing; is it a general class of things?" He then goes on to show the way to define. After a few weeks in which at least one definition is taken each day, boys of average intelligence will be well on their way to having acquired an ability to define.

Somewhere in the English course the syllogism pops up, disturbs a few brain cells and passes on. The history teacher should cooperate with his colleague of the English department and practice the boys in syllogisms. For instance, give the propositions: "All settlers in New France were of the Catholic Faith. Now Samuel de Champlain was a settler in New France. What was his faith?" Or another, "All Scandinavian peoples become Lutheran. But the Danes are Scandinavian. Of what faith are they?" It may all seem too simple. But you will find it mighty fine practice-training for the future Aristotles and Aquinases. I remember a bright pupil in one of my classes, who learned everything one could expect a sophomore in high school to pick up about his country's history. But when the year was up, he told

another teacher that the most important thing he got out of the history class was the ability to define.

History offers plenty of material for good *conversation*. This at first seems an insignificant reason for studying history: but just keep your ears open for a week; see how few men talk about other things besides sports and national or world affairs.

Many men I have known have found some phase of historical study a delightful *hobby*. A doctor of my acquaintance has enlivened his spare time by a study of local history. A philosophy professor numbers among his chief recreations the reading of American biographies. A high school boy has the unusual hobby of gathering information on railroads. This includes, naturally enough, a great deal of history.

What I said of our country, can be equally emphasized in regard to our *Church*. A knowledge of it, usually leads to a greater appreciation. Besides this, history has another religious value. "The authentic records of History", wrote Pope Leo XIII, "when considered with a calm mind and free from prejudices are in themselves a magnificent and spontaneous *apology* for the Church and the Pontificate. In them may be seen the nature and true greatness of Christian institutions".⁴

History, lastly, is a *background* and a *laboratory* for other subjects, such as sociology, law, literature, political science, economics, military and naval science. The cadet studies the campaigns of Stonewall Jackson or of Napoleon Bonaparte; the statesman goes to history to find out just why previous enlargements of the Supreme Court have been made.

To quote Father McGucken again:

History can do much—not the cramming of facts, the useless repetition of lists of kings and presidents, battles and dynasties, but the sort of history that will take the facts, weigh them, fashion them into a coherent whole, trace the influence of cause and effect, see the relationships between our own age and that of a civilization that has disappeared from the face of the earth.⁵

With these words, we close our section on motives and objectives.

Catholic Press

(Continued from page 6)

Knownothingism, but if some Catholics were enervated by that rumor, they were reminded that a Catholic supports authority not out of expediency but out of duty.²¹

The New York *Tablet* was pro-Union, and immediately after Lincoln's election it reminded its readers that every good citizen must submit to the will of the majority. Moreover, Lincoln, who had lived in the South, would not violate the constitution nor infringe on Southern rights.²² The following January the paper explained that the loyal American was irate because the flag had been fired on, and, when the South seized Federal forts, revenge must be expected.²³ In April, when war was declared, the paper's comment was: "The United States government must put forth all its energy to put down the rebellion, and every true man must stand up for the Stars and Stripes." Two weeks later an editorial gave this epitome:

We shall also, with God's help, come out of the fiery ordeal, a

²¹ *Ibid.*, Aug. 10, 1861

²² *Tablet*, Nov. 17, 1860.

²³ *Ibid.*, Jan. 19, 1861

³ C. E. Schrader, "History, a Training for Life", *HISTORICAL BULLETIN*, XIV (Nov., 1935), 6

⁴ Leo XIII, *loc. cit.*

⁵ McGucken, *op. cit.*

nation. The pestilent heresy of State supremacy over the general law, of the nonexistence of any obligation on the part of one state toward another or towards all the others, shall perish in the flames. Liberty will thenceforth be the rule, Slavery the exception. The interests of millions of free white laborers will be recognized at last and no longer sacrificed to those of 350,000 slaveholders. The public lands will no longer be refused to the free immigrant because slavery wants them kept in large tracts and not divided up into small farms to be worked by the free arms of an intelligent yeomanry. In short, the great republican principle, that the majority shall rule and the minority submit, will be thoroughly and firmly established as the keystone of our republican arch.²⁴

The *Herald and Visitor* of Philadelphia believed in state rights and espoused them during the Lincoln campaign. "Among the rights and powers retained by the states are those of either establishing or abolishing, within their own borders, the institution of African slavery."²⁵ Shortly after the election the paper reiterated its stand as also its love of peace.

We preferred to give our voice, and still do give our voice, if the Union must be dissolved, for the alternative of peaceable dissolution, or secession, on the part of such states as are tired of the co-partnership, confederation, federal compact, constitutional union, or by whatever other name our political existence may be called.²⁶

A week later it was observed that the federal government was only an agency vested with power to do certain things, and that it had no power to force a state to enter, remain in, or leave the Union.

Peaceable secession, not armed revolution, is the course the South should pursue, if her now undoubtedly violated rights should not be restored to their original integrity by those northern states who have nullified and treated with more than contempt the constitutional laws enacted by Congress for the preservation of southern property. And while we contend for the peaceable secession from the Union on the one side, we at the same time most earnestly deprecate the resort to forcible detention in the Union on the other.

It seems that the *Herald* agreed with the *Miscellany*, which argued that states enter partnerships like individuals for mutual benefit. If one is always the loser and insulted besides, the maxim *Frangenti fidem fides frangatur eidem* applies.²⁷

Though the *Universe* was a British paper without influence in the States, a series of squibs signed "Shamrock" is noteworthy. The Federals, for one thing, love the Blacks so much that they will not even ride in the same car with them! Again, the Irish never have been sufficiently appreciated by the North, hence they are foolish for fighting its battles. They presume Lincoln will free Ireland in gratitude, but this is impossible because Napoleon is an ally of England. Then, why should the Irish fight the Southerners who never injured them? True, slavery is to be disapproved, but the sufferings of slaves have been exaggerated and the real motive of the Northern attack is to avenge Sumter with the slavery issue as a pretext. "Shamrock" wrote thus early in 1862, but an editorial of October 11, the same year, did not align itself with his views. "It appears that the slave will be freed. The slaughter of the past eighteen months will not have been in vain. All lovers of freedom will be happy to see the negro free on the first of January."

In conclusion, it appears that the Catholic newspaper took up the war question with considerable vigor and

with independent views. Generally speaking, the democratic attitude toward state rights met with favor, the fanaticism of the abolitionists was universally disapproved, slavery was considered undesirable but incapable of sudden extirpation, and a large measure of war guilt was ascribed to the Protestant preachers who had ranted about the horrors of slavery. The secular journals took little heed of the Catholic press, but the story of the Civil War is incomplete without its comments. This concatenation of fragments is but an excursion into that field. The writer has browsed where he could. He can merely point the way to further research.²⁸

Editorials

(Continued from page 8)

is published as companion to an earlier volume which was reviewed in the BULLETIN for March. If the book carries a thesis, it may probably be reduced to this: An intellectual point of view, as opposed to earlier "magical" and "mystical" gropings, "triumphed in the development of modern Western science and culminated during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in the conception of the universe and society as a closed harmonious order." But, we are told, the suspicion is now strong that this closed harmonious order has no general validity. Where we disagree with this book we can do so without being disagreeable.

Richelieu was a master of statecraft. From whatever heaven he occupies above the screaming sirens of a disintegrating Europe his eagle eye can now survey the remote consequences of his own work. His latest biographer (Carl J. Burckhardt, *Richelieu*. Oxford University Press) tells us he foresaw "the rise of conscious and separate and exclusive nations as an unavoidable law of the near future, and set himself to prepare for it by erecting the centralized state." To what extent he deserves credit, or blame, for the present Nationalist (Nazi, Fascist, Imperialist) frenzy is, of course, a matter of debate. But if he can be called the chief builder in the political order of modern Europe, he was, by the same token the ruthless destroyer of the real Europe, which was Christendom.

One may admire, one can hardly help admiring the clairvoyant vision, the inexorable firmness of purpose with which he pursued his ends. Rarely in a national leader has spirit, mind, will so dominated a pain-wracked body. Essentially a subordinate, dependent upon a fluctuating royal will, surrounded always during the days of his rise to power by intriguing enemies, he yet steered his precarious course with consummate skill, and eventually drove through every obstacle to a complete triumph. He left his king the master of France and France the arbiter of Europe. But in a sense the Revolution was a late judgment on both his "absolute" state and his "autocrat" king. More clearly, perhaps, the chaos in Europe today is the logical denouement of his exaltation of national politics over the higher values of Christian civilization. The conscience of Richelieu the builder apparently did not trouble him. Callous and ruthless, he scattered destruction along his victorious path. We may question, though he never did, the wisdom of exalting any nation to heights from which it is bound to crash.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, May 4, 1861

²⁵ *Herald and Visitor*, Oct. 20, 1860

²⁶ *Ibid.*, Nov. 24, 1860

²⁷ *Ibid.*, Dec. 22, 1860

²⁸ Numerous quotations will be found in the writer's articles on the Civil War which appeared in the *Salesianum*, 1937-9.

Book Reviews

America's Economic Growth, by Fred A. Shannon. New York. Macmillan. 1940. pp. viii + 867. \$3.75

In this book, a revision of the author's *Economic History of The People of The United States*, one of the most popular texts in the field of American economic history is brought up to date. Many improvements, both in style and content, are noted: more concentrated consideration of the significant phases in modern developments; the separate treatment of consumers goods and capital goods, of industries and their productive elements; and a close analysis of the more significant economic adjustments occurring during the past decade. The reader will find the same thorough treatment of tariff, capitalization policies, consumption trends, and tariff laws as was exhibited in the previous work. There is one important improvement effected by the manner in which Professor Shannon applies the data of these factors in determining prices and, hence, the direction of economic readjustment at the present time.

In the main this book displays an acute objective treatment, which reflects the scholarship of its author. Definite and dignified stands are taken on all important questions, as may be seen in his commendation of Van Buren's policies, his condemnation of imperialism and "dollar diplomacy," his low opinion of our tariff record. In treating the later phases of our economic development, however, he is, perhaps, a bit too general in identifying all opponents of New Deal social reform measures with the *laissez faire* group. When he charts the fortunes of N. R. A., for example, the author states that plutocratically inclined "Supreme Court Justices evolved constitutional objections." This and other equally controverted conclusions add nothing to his discerning analysis. This is a much more attractive book than the former volume, the print being larger and more readable and the style better by virtue of greater succinctness.

JAMES HANLEY.

The Fight for the Panama Route, by Dwight Carroll Miner. Columbia University Press. New York. 1940. pp. xv 469. \$4.00

The Panama Canal incident highlights the history of our relations with Latin America. As a result of it arose that attitude of suspicion and caution which, as the author would have it, is only now, through the good graces of a second Roosevelt, changing into something akin to neighborly confidence.

In this well-told, well-documented story the author gives us the background and course of the domestic and international politics of Colombia, Panama and the United States. Particularly interesting is the explanation of the Colombian side of the question—an element in the case not too well understood, and, consequently, the cause of much wrong interpretation.

The author has been fairly successful in eliminating partisanship from his work. Too many writers on this incident see Theodore Roosevelt either as a strong-willed champion of world rights, using the best means possible with those whom he considered "foolish and homicidal corruptionists in Bogatá," or as an out-and-out international robber, conspirator and swindler.

The lobbying, pressure politics, diplomatic manipulations and congressional maneuvers, so prominent a part of the Panama story are well explained and presented by the author. The volume contains several pertinent appendices, an extensive bibliography and index. The few maps, though, are not too satisfactory.

MARTIN HASTING.

Gallitzin's Letters, a Collection of the Polemical Works of the Very Reverend Prince Demetrius Augustine Gallitzin, edited by Grace Murphy. Loretto, Pa. The Angelmodde Press. 1940. pp. 302. \$3.00

Demetrius Augustine Gallitzin died in 1840. This collection of his polemical works has been published to mark the centenary of his death. One may open the volume at any page and find it interesting, refreshing, easy to read. The letters, written in a free, rapid-flowing style, are packed with close reasoning that was meant to produce conviction. A hundred years ago, it was said that "no other books of their kind have made so many converts." At the present time, whatever their practical utility, they remain a valuable historical monument.

For the historian the letters of Father Gallitzin serve as a mirror of conditions against which the Church had to struggle

when the Protestant Tradition was still strong. They also reflect the soul of their very remarkable writer and his very remarkable background. Prince Demetrius Gallitzin was the son of a Russian nobleman high in the service of Catherine II. He was even more distinguished in his mother, Princess Amalia von Gallitzin. This fairy Godmother of the Münster Circle was a creative force in the revival of German Catholicism. But Demetrius was not content to be a mere heir. And he left rich material for his biographer during his forty years of apostolic labor in and around Loretto, Pennsylvania. We await impatiently the English version of his life-story, which should be released before this review is printed. Meantime, with a friendly salute to Miss Grace Murphy, who has edited the *Letters*, we recommend this volume to our readers.

R. CORRIGAN.

Papal Enforcement of Some Medieval Marriage Laws, by Charles Edward Smith, Louisiana State University Press. pp. viii + 230. \$2.50

The subject matter of the present volume, as well as the fact that it is a revision of a doctoral dissertation, indicate that it is hardly a book of universal or wide appeal. The treatment and format are scholarly to the last detail; the text is everywhere abundantly annotated, and an exhaustive bibliography completes the work.

Dr. Smith confines himself to a study and discussion of early legislation and its enforcement regarding the two ecclesiastical impediments to matrimony of consanguinity and affinity, including in the latter those commonly referred to as public honesty and spiritual relationship. His investigation into, and summarization of numerous early documents and customs dealing with these impediments should be of worth to anyone interested in that field of research. His handling of Catholic sources manifests not only competency but keen understanding of their content and spirit. In his introduction, however, where he outlines the Church's impediments to the valid contracting of matrimony, there seems to be inexactness in the following statement when compared with the Code of Canon Law: "Adultery is ground for nullity in that it violates the basic, monogamous nature of the marital union." "Valide contrahere nequeunt matrimonium qui, perdurante eodem legitimo matrimonio, adulterium inter se consummarunt et fidem sibi mutuo dederunt de matrimonio ineundo vel ipsum matrimonium, etiam per civilem tantum actum, attentarunt." (Can. 1075)

Particularly interesting reading is afforded by the cases selected in illustration of the enforcement of these marriage laws. Papal action in the celebrated cases of Lothair II, Philip Augustus, Alfonso IX, and other famous medieval characters is described. The period covered in the book ends with the pontificate of Boniface VIII (1294-1303).

PATRICK J. HOLLORAN.

Classical Civilization, I, Greece, by H. N. Couch; *II, Rome*, by R. M. Geer. New York. Prentice-Hall. 1940. pp. xxxii + 578, xxiv + 414. \$4.65 (\$3.50), \$4.00 (\$3.00)

The purpose of both volumes of this series is to introduce Classical Civilization to the undergraduate student. In the words of the Preface to the first volume: "This book has grown out of the desire to present a proportioned picture of the enduring qualities of ancient Greek civilization. For a study of this nature the reader should be able to reflect on the artistic and literary endeavors of the Greeks against a background of their political and social history. To attain such a continuity and cohesion of thought, the discussion of art and literature has not been planned as material incidental and correlative to the history of Greece, but rather the chapters on historical themes have been interspersed as a necessary background to the study of cultural topics." Thus, it is only fair that we should criticize this book, not only from the standpoint of history, but also as an interpretation of Classical culture.

First of all, this series embodies one of the false principles upon which much of our modern education is built. The book attempts to treat so many and such comprehensive subjects (philosophy, literature, sculpture, architecture, and the crafts) that it treats all inadequately, even according to "survey" standards. The interpretation of culture finds itself for the most part, of course, in the volume on Greece. The author here shows

all too often a bias characteristic of a man steeped in materialistic civilization. The statement that "Sophocles has no passionate beauty" is ridiculous to a reader who knows cultural values. The author's over-praise and defence of the poet Euripides clearly betrays an uncritical and warped judgment of great literature. Especially disappointing, too, is the treatment of the Great Socratics, Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle. What can we think of such statements as "Socrates' greatest error arose from his own single-minded devotion to truth and honesty. Socrates is too much the classifier of moral ideas." Although his discussion of Plato is fair, his treatment of Aristotle is very inadequate.

Volume II, although based upon the same principles which we have already condemned, is a better organized and better conceived picture of the civilization it seeks to portray. His treatment of the Roman constitution and Roman law is particularly good. Our only regret is that he did not develop this important phase into a central theme and unify the other phases of Roman life about it in order to give his book more organic unity.

But perhaps the reviewer is too severe upon what are, after all, meant as mere textbooks. Nevertheless, in his opinion, the authors have, like many others, attempted the impossible. Single-semester survey courses may impart a certain amount of inorganic *eruditio*, but mere knowledge is never education.

T. CRONIN.

Richelieu: His Rise to Power, by Carl J. Burckhardt. New York. Oxford University Press. 1940. pp. 413. \$3.75

This is not the kind of book that a reviewer can read in a hurry. One may, for example, skim through the pages of Belloc's *Richelieu*, pick up the author's thought anywhere on the surface and, finally, drop the book with a feeling that he has not missed anything essential to the story,—or thesis. But in working over this mass of packed detail the reader finds himself doubling back again and again. Two or three full-length portraits from the pen of Belloc could be disposed of with less effort than is required to follow Burckhardt in his study of Richelieu up to 1630. Yet the book is well worth reading though the author, for all his flare of objectivity, betrays a dislike and a misunderstanding of the Jesuits. The utter absence of footnotes is disappointing. But this may be due to the "abridging" of the translators. The central theme of the author calls for a brief editorial.

R. C.

The Agadir Crisis, by I. C. Barlow. Chapel Hill. University of North Carolina Press. 1940. pp. viii + 422 \$4.00

The years just prior to the First World War were filled with a round of international crises which were symptomatic of the underlying causes and spirit of rampant imperialism. The present monograph is an interesting and scholarly study of one of the most important of these crises. The authoress quite aptly, therefore, gives us not only the "inside" details of the crisis which would be interesting enough, but also seeks to explain the significance of attitudes and policies.

Miss Barlow has turned out an interesting and valuable study of the situation. She writes clearly and interestingly. The work is thoroughly documented, well indexed, and contains an imposing bibliography.

R. L. PORTER.

Manual for the Arrangement and Description of Archives, by Muller, Feith, and Fruin (translated by A. H. Leavitt). New York. H. W. Wilson Company. 1940. pp. 225. \$3.50

Since America has come of age, increasing attention has been given to archival material. To all libraries has come the problem of an intelligent ordering for easy and practical use of many and varied kinds of valuable records. American archivists in the past have had to go to authorities in foreign languages for help in their work. Now they have access to clear and complete directions in their own language through an English translation of the standard work here reviewed. Mr. Leavitt, in making this translation from the original Dutch, has done American archivists a very good turn.

The book, be it noted, is a manual. It is a work to be gradually assimilated and referred to on occasion rather than read through at a sitting or two. The reading of it, as the author warns us, is a tedious task, but a painstaking study for application amply repays the time and the efforts of the archivist. All librarians confronted with archival problems will find this book exceedingly useful.

HUBERT MCKEMIE.

Political and Social Growth of the American People, 1492-1865, by Homer Carey Hockett. Third Edition. New York. Macmillan. 1940. \$3.25

Historical Evolution of Hispanic America, by J. Fred Rippy. Second Edition. New York. F. S. Crofts & Co. 1940. \$3.75

This short note aims to call the attention of readers to new editions of familiar works. In order to allow his fellow-author of the *Political and Social Growth of the American People*, Arthur Meier Schlesinger, sufficient space in which to account for most recent United States developments, Mr. Hockett has extended his half of the story from the earlier date of 1852 to 1865. This has necessitated certain omissions and curtailments in the colonial story. These have, however, been arranged carefully and the new edition does not suffer. This new volume is very helpfully illustrated and in every way comes up to the standard as set by the original and second editions.

Mr. Rippy has brought his very useful study of Hispanic America down to date, principally by a re-working of his last chapter, which deals largely with foreign relations. A short discussion of "The Fascist Threat" gives the work an up-to-the-minute flavor. Mr. Rippy has taken this opportunity of a new edition to meet criticisms of his original work by much greater insistence on social and cultural questions. We are sure that teachers will continue to find the *Historical Evolution of Hispanic America* the same helpful and "teachable" book which they have known.

JOHN F. BANNON.

Katherine Tekakwitha: The Position of the Historical Section of the Sacred Congregation of Rites on the Introduction of the Cause for Beatification and Canonization and on the Virtues of the Servant of God. New York. Fordham University Press. 1940. pp. viii + 469

Here is a fitting tribute to one of America's greatest glories, Katherine Tekakwitha, the Lily of the Mohawks. The externals of this volume are extremely attractive. The editors and publishers have made use of a de luxe binding, a special *Tekakwitha* Wove paper, bold, clear type, striking frontispiece, end papers, woodcuts and border design to make all the more effective their purpose—the presentation of the work "for the edification of the faithful." The edition is limited. Any book lover will be delighted with it.

The documents which make up this English version of the *Positio* of the Historical Section of the Sacred Congregation of Rites in Katherine's cause are of prime importance and great interest. They include pertinent letters of Father de Lamberville, who baptized Katherine, her biography by Father Chauchetière, a personal friend and advisor, and her "Life" by Father Cholenec, Katherine's confessor who administered the Last Sacraments to her. From these we have a first-hand estimation of the virtues and sanctity of this Iroquois maiden whom all Americans, and especially her beloved Indians, hope to see soon raised to the highest honors of the altar.

MARTIN HASTING.

Indian Summer, 1865-1915, by Van Wyck Brooks. New York. E. P. Dutton & Company. 1940. pp. 540. \$3.75

The first line of the author's own preface says everything that a review should say about this work. "This book [is] a sequel of *The Flowering of New England* . . ." And as a sequel it measures up. There is the same richness of detail and the same shrewdness of observation; there is the same power of sketching a biography in miniature in a few accurate yet sympathetic lines. If it is in any way a lesser book than the previous volume, it is only because the critic was examining a lesser period.

New England: Indian Summer connects up the yesterdays with today. From Howells and the Adamases to Frost and Millay is the period it covers. This was a time of transition, and the absence of any rigid and artificial pattern in the structure of the book helps to bring out the fact that it was just such a period of shift and transition.

The book treats primarily the writers of the age but that does not make it a book only for the literary minded. It is for anyone interested in the cultural history of America. Better, perhaps, than any other work it gets at the roots of change in the New England of the post-Civil War days. The shift in ideals and standards, the rise of industry, the passing of classicism and the coming of the scientific outlook, the bewilderment of men groping for something, they know not exactly what,—

these strands that went into the weaving of the modern American pattern are all deftly untangled and sorted.

The book so captures the attention that undiscerning readers may forget that even Boston with all its environs was not the whole of the United States and that there were American writers who did not belong to the Bostonian solar system. But that hint to the unwary is merely another way of saying that Van Wyck Brooks has measured up to his own high standards in this his second volume on the literary history of New England.

E. J. DRUMMOND.

Propaganda in Germany During the Thirty Years War, (with 25 plates), by Elmer A. Beller. Princeton University Press. 1940. pp. 49. \$10.00

Here is a book of forty-nine pages that sells for ten dollars. It will not be bought by poor students,—nor by impecunious professors, for that matter. But for the librarian or the book-lover who can afford the outlay it is worth its price. The publisher has done an excellent job in the expensive reproduction of original prints, and Dr. Beller deserves credit for his research, selection and translation, and for his comment on the propaganda literature of three hundred years ago. We have enlarged upon this in an editorial.

R. C.

Montesquieu and English Politics, 1750-1800, by F. T. H. Fletcher. New York. Longmans. 1940. pp. 286. \$4.50

The value of studying the intellectual history of man is becoming more and more apparent. The value of this study is two-fold; first the intellectual thought of the period mirrors very well the problems, spirit, and intellectual vitality of an age; and secondly, light is cast forward into the future development of history, which does, in some degree, receive a certain character from the thought which directs the solution of that age's problems. Eighteenth-century Europe is an age which intrigues the student of human development. Here is an age of transition in which powerful new forces were shifting the foundations from beneath existing political, social, and economic institutions. And, since these forces of change were also to some degree apparent to contemporaries, it was an age of intellectual ferment of a kind which was characteristic of that age and along lines which were to find fruition in the century to come. One of the most outstanding and influential of the thinkers of that age was Charles Secondat, Baron de Montesquieu.

Mr. Fletcher has attempted to show the influence of Montesquieu upon the intellectual ferment of his own country. The works of Carcassonne and Knust have respectively shown the influence of Montesquieu upon the thought of France and the United States. But Mr. Fletcher maintains that the influence of Montesquieu was greater in England than in any other country, not even excepting France. After all, as he points out, the second half of the eighteenth century was a period of constant overflow of ideas between the two countries, resulting in a considerable interpenetration of their very different types of civilization. No Englishman's education was considered complete unless he had lived and moved in French society, and possessed more than a mere tincture of French culture. Chesterfield, Gibbon, Hume, and Horace Walpole were typical members of a sect of distinguished English Francophiles; Montesquieu, Voltaire, Rousseau, the Abbé Prévost and many others had not merely lived in England for a long time, but for the most part prided themselves upon their connections with the best English society.

Mr. Fletcher proceeds to present his subject topically. Montesquieu as a writer received wide acclaim in England and inspired many English works; he created the idea of a political economy, distinct and separate, freed from the tutelage of political science; he was the advocate of a new basis for law, namely that of history and climate; he crystallized in England the ideals of a mixed constitution and a separation of powers; he generated new attitudes of social and political introspection on the part of the English people which led to a reform movement; he influenced the ideas of the American Revolution, the reform of policy towards India, and concepts on slavery.

Of course, Mr. Fletcher agrees that Montesquieu's chief influence was to give a powerful impetus to a "new history." Not only did he inspire the works of Gibbon and Ferguson which refused to treat history as a mere sequence of facts, but he is largely responsible for the new attitude toward the past as a "unity of historical experience" which should function as an empirical arsenal for the legal and social sciences. This book should prove of interest to students of eighteenth-century history, of English constitutional and social history, and of

Montesquieu. The style is not captivating but it is clear; for the sincere student of politics, however, that is enough.

R. L. PORTER.

Sociology, by Walter L. Willigan and John J. O'Connor. New York. Longmans. 1940. pp. xi & 387. \$2.00

This new introductory text in sociology aims at the objective which is indicated in the social encyclicals of the Popes. A theory of society here presented is interwoven with sound philosophy, Catholic theology and practical empirical research. The text is welcome at a time when not a few in Catholic circles seem to be unaware of this objective.

The authors waste no time and energy in searching for the subject matter of sociology. Science is not made an end in itself. The end of sociology as expressed by the encyclicals and by the authors is to improve the living together of human beings, who do have human hearts and souls. The introductory chapters on Contemporary Society and Techniques and Errors make this clear. Separate chapters are given to the Body, the Soul, and the Mind of Man, as also to what should be the "Good Society." One chapter is devoted to Man's Group Life, three chapters to Man and His Culture, and three to Man's Societal Processes. How man has solved the social problem in the past and how he is solving it in the present are questions discussed in other chapters. Satisfactory summaries, questions, projects and bibliographies are provided. Helpful and scientific are the tables of technical definitions.

Considerable supplementation will be necessary for College use. The internal structure of a few chapters is somewhat original, for example those dealing with the body of man and with social processes. One reviewer has criticized the treatment of the rhythm theory and of corporatism. The text is generally worthy of much praise. It is above all a clear and simple antidote to a poisonous brand of "scientific" sociology which could be a prelude to amorality, immorality, indifferentism, nominalism, behaviorism, and totalitarianism.

WM. G. DOWNING.

A History of Economic Ideas, by Edmund Whittaker. New York. Longmans. pp. 766. \$4.00

Two qualities render this work interesting, its scope and its methods. The scope is the history of *ideas* from the Veddas of Ceylon and the Trobriand Islanders of the Melanesian Archipelago down to Wesley Mitchell and Othmar Spann. And the structure is not epochal but conceptual; each single notion, wealth, production, money, etc., is taken singly over the whole range of human thought. In the course of this tour, a large knowledge of economic literature is revealed and numerous suggestive relationships appear which other methods of treatment obscure.

Both projects, however, are hazardous. When we deal with the views of other days and peoples, the utmost care is needed that we do not impose our categories on their thinking. To do justice to them a genuine insight into their attitude is required. Despite the author's obvious effort at careful history, there is grave reason to doubt whether these ends have been achieved, and in dealing with patristic and scholastic writers they have not been achieved. Axial questions in these areas are dealt with superficially and erroneously with much obvious shopping in the second-hand stores of medieval economics, Ashley, O'Brien and Beer. At times the author's metahistory stands exposed as when Lucretius' views on the primitive family are quoted as significant, but the accounts of missionaries are rejected as those of 'untrained observers'. Even an untrained observer (which many missionaries were not and are not) might in the presence of the facts be a better source of knowledge of primitive conditions than Lucretius.

B. W. DEMPSEY.

The Jesuit in Focus, by James J. Daly. Milwaukee. Bruce Publishing Company. 1940. pp. xii + 212. \$2.25

Four hundred years ago a group of men under the name of "Society of Jesus" was given legal corporate existence by the approbation of Pope Paul III. Since that time the Jesuits have occupied a significant role on the stage of European and world history, and no history book is complete without some mention of their important work. The work of the Jesuits has particularly captivated the imaginations of many historians and scholars who either were not Catholic or for some reason or other were opposed to their principles and ideals. As a result, our book shelves have been filled with fantastic interpretations of Jesuit prowess and Jesuit iniquity. Historians who have failed to penetrate beneath the surface of Jesuit lives have sought to

explain their often marvelous successes through sinister intentions, Machiavellian means, and a Leninistic subversion of the individual. "Jesuitism," "Jesuit Obedience," and "end justifies the means" have become stock phrases in our literature.

Father James J. Daly is a Jesuit and a man who has been a member of that order for fifty years. In this book he tries to explain just what kind of man the Jesuit is and in what "The Secret and Power of the Jesuits" consists. He makes no startling revelations, unless his revelations be startling because they are so commonplace. But he does rip off the black cloak which hides the real Jesuit from the world and shows him as he really is. The result is quite disappointing to the sensation-seeking journalist and the quasi-historian.

The reviewer does not consider the book to be "brilliant," but it is a very clear and cogent presentation of the subject. The work is not a comprehensive and logical treatise of the subject which will exhaust the subject of Jesuits for all time. Father Daly merely presents a series of essays on certain key aspects of the Jesuit, aspects which people usually do not realize or see only in a mist of confusion. The style is crisp and clear; the matter is emphatically arranged. No historian who puzzles over the "Jesuit enigma" or their "secret and power" can afford to miss this book.

R. L. PORTER.

The Atlantic Migration, 1607-1860, by Marcus Lee Hansen (Edited by Arthur M. Schlesinger). Cambridge. Harvard University Press. 1940. pp. xvii & 391. \$3.50

Within the current year Carl Wittke has told us how thirty-eight million foreigners helped to make America great. *We Who Built America* is a book with a suggestive title. It tells us what the immigrant did in his new home. And now we have the posthumous volume of Marcus Lee Hansen to tell us *why* the immigrant, the flood of immigrants in wave on wave, came to our shores. The story, packed with factual detail, is well told. The author gathered his data where alone it was to be found, in the archives of Europe, in the files of forty or fifty newspapers, in private correspondence, in contemporary books and booklets. And here he shares with us at least part of what he has combed out of the records, printed and unprinted, during four years abroad. The book should be in every historical library.

When the author died, two years ago, he had planned a trilogy, the second volume of which would treat the great "Teutonic" period from 1860 to 1882, while the third volume would be devoted to the migration from the Mediterranean and Slavic areas of Europe. The successive groups he finds distinguished, each by a type of agricultural economy. In the present volume the Rhineland peasants are, by a little straining, brought into the "Celtic" category. Probably, the best tribute one can pay to the author is to express regret for the loss of the book still unwritten.

Quite naturally, economic factors dominate the scene. Hard times in Europe and the promise of prosperity in America, industrial expansion and bad harvests, the ups and downs of the lowly potato, these provided the push on the one hand and the pull on the other that led millions to tempt the terrors of weeks at sea and the uncertainties of a new land. But there was always enough of sentiment, of memories and heart-ties to quicken or retard the economic urge. The emigrant might move because he was discouraged by his losing fight at home or because a sudden upturn of fortune had enabled him to pay his passage to freedom and brighter hope in America. In any case, the America he glimpsed was rarely the reality; it was the picture colored by the publicity agent or, more frequently perhaps, by the neighbor or relative who had made good and told his story in letters that the whole village eagerly read. At the moment, Europe is doing its tragic best to make us want to forget that we are Europeans. But the building of our national power and of the American dream as well has its own intrinsic interest, and this book presents a chapter of the past we want to know and remember.

R. CORRIGAN.

Mr. Pitt and America's Birthright, by J. C. Long. New York. Frederick A. Stokes Company. 1940. pp. xiii 576. \$3.50

In his Introduction to Notes the author of this new biography of the Great Commoner gives as one reason for this publication the necessity for drawing attention to Pitt's views on democracy in an age when the issues of the day were comparable to those that confront thinking men and women of our own generation.

It is a very laudable reason and one that ought of itself to compel attention. The parallel is made obvious by such chapter headings as "The Cliveden Set" (though the eighteenth century set was one that had no thought of appeasement) and "Paris-Madrid Axis." The unusual method of taking a relatively minor incident out of Pitt's life and making it serve as an introductory chapter drives home the point, which students of the eighteenth century might at first be inclined to challenge, that Pitt was really imbued with the democratic spirit. The illustrations are also sufficient to convince the sceptical as the photographs of the Charleston, S. C., statue and the Chelsea statuette prove.

Apart from sustaining interest by reason of parallel modern problems the book is remarkable for a wealth of detail that betrays a profound knowledge of the eighteenth century milieu. The style of the author is refreshing and even commanding as, for instance, when he refers to Lady Pitt as being "personable in a Percheron fashion" or when he describes the incident of the Whig horse at King George's coronation banquet. The bibliography, like the notes, is adequate and lacking in pedantry. On the whole the book is one that arouses interest, and one that is published at the opportune time.

H. H. COULSON.

American History to 1865, by George M. Stephenson. New York. Harper. 1940. pp. x + 698. \$3.50

Several very good topical and cultural chapters, particularly in the second half of this work, keep it from being catalogued as "just another American history." These chapters apart, Mr. Stephenson has written a satisfactory survey of the period, but not one which deserves the designation of new or outstanding. In summarizing such things as immigration, material progress, spiritual life, and intellectual activity, he offers some very excellent short studies. We would like to thank him for the intelligent treatment accorded the Catholic Church as a factor in American life and development. Very few authors take the trouble to do more than mention that institution. Mr. Stephenson has acquainted himself with much of the literature on the subject and has told the Catholic story with unwonted fullness.

JOHN F. BANNON.

Church and State in Russia: the Last Years of the Empire, 1900-1917, by John Shelton Curtiss. New York. Columbia University Press. 1940. pp. ix & 442. \$4.00

Christianity came to Russia from Constantinople. With its sacramental system intact, very nearly complete in its doctrine and splendid in its oriental ceremonial, the divine element in it was weighted down by the gilded slavery of a diseased ecclesiastical order. Deeply religious souls, saintly men and women, lived and died in the great schismatic community. But for most of us Orthodoxy has always been the tool of Tsarist autocracy. From the Holy Synod at its apex down to the ignorant peasant with his superstitions the spiritual power was so closely bound to the temporal that it had little freedom for any vital movement of its own. Pious Tsars and their pious ministers sincerely promoted the religious life of the people. But Byzantine Caesaro-papalism, on the Bosphorus, at Moscow, or wherever it rules, is a perversion of right order.

Dr. Curtiss devotes only thirty pages to the long millennium up to the year 1900. The major portion of his book reads like a coroner's report. From a wide variety of sources, largely Russian and therefore beyond the reach of most readers, he has gathered details, economic, political, cultural and religious, of the drooping old age of the unhappy pair, Autocracy and Orthodoxy. "The Sway of Rasputin" is the caption of his final chapter. If the Church of Russia cannot be blamed for the fatal ascendancy of a nauseating impostor, neither can it wholly shake off the bad odor that clings to the memory of his monk's gown. Here, we have an extreme case of religion being made ridiculous by a weak Tsar and a silly Tsaritsa. Dr. Curtiss tells the story merely because it is part of the record. Nor does he embellish in unduly, as he might have done had he wished to appeal to the curious reader. His book is a contribution to sober history.

R. CORRIGAN.

A Spanish Tudor, by H. F. M. Prescott, New York. Columbia University Press. 1940. pp. xii + 562. \$5.00

Few historical characters have suffered so much from fostered prejudices and professional slander as Mary Tudor. The ground-in tradition of a "Bloody Mary," begun by calculating politicians,

still lives. Recently, though, several attempts have been made to arrive at a more correct evaluation of Mary and her life and actions. The present work, a fine contribution to the historiography of the period, follows these lines.

There is a great deal of history packed in the documented pages of this volume. The continental background, diplomatic intrigues, domestic situations, and personal attitudes and actions of the most prominent figures in English history of these times are rather carefully yet brightly portrayed. However, the tone of the work is marred somewhat through an inadequate grasp of some phases of Catholic life and a few points of historical importance. For instance, it is not correct to say that the Pope "might have been willing to confirm any divorce, to dispense with any prohibition for the King of England at another time." Regardless of the pressure of Charles V, or of anyone else, there are violations of *God's law* which cannot and could not be approved. Such would have been the dissolution of Henry's marriage. Equally remote was the possibility of granting "a dispensation to Henry to have two wives." However, Miss Prescott is to be commended for her honest effort to give us a truer and more understanding picture of the much-misunderstood and maligned Mary Tudor.

MARTIN HASTING.

France, 1815 to the Present, by John B. Wolf. New York. Prentice-Hall. 1940. pp. xi & 565. \$3.00

The bourgeois France here portrayed is the France of only yesterday, the France which emerged from the travail and torment of the Revolution and, after four generations of mingled apostasy, internal tension and youthful enthusiasm, came to a raw end within the past few months. The author did not know, when he planned his story, that the turn of events would provide its present tragic denouement. History has no endings like the drama or the novel. But there does seem to be a rounded-out completeness here. Maybe, we are wrong. But the historian speaks of the Old Régime as of a thing long dead and buried though he knows that its spirit lived on partly by reason of the eternal values it cherished and partly because some Frenchmen still hoped to recover the lost privileges of their fathers. Analogously, the France of the Revolution will not wholly die. The good things which came out of the Revolution will revive, and some of its poison will linger on in the sons of the anti-clerical republicans.

The reviewer has been agreeably surprised. In fact, there were two surprises in the book. First of all, the book looked like the usual run of the mill variety which a publisher or editor solicits to fill out a series. In this case the book is worth reading, and it is easy to read. Secondly, the preface aroused the suspicion that the author was ready to sell his soul for the malodorous thing we call French "Liberal Democracy." Much as we like liberty and equality and fraternity, their wild application by French radicals offends our common sense as Americans, Christians, and reasonable beings. And we feel that the greatest weakness in the democracy we love lies in its too close association with historical "Liberalism." On the other hand, we are always interested in the objective facts of "Liberal" history. And we found in Professor Wolf an historian sincerely trying to tell his story as it was without being unduly influenced by his philosophy.

R. CORRIGAN.

El Libro, la Imprenta y el Periodismo en América durante la Dominación Española, por José Torre Revello. Buenos Aires. Casa Jacobo Peuser. 1940. pp. 269 + ccxxxviii + 19.

The printing press was at work in America over four hundred years ago. And the glory of pioneering in this truly modern activity belongs to Mexico. This question of priority has long been settled, though too frequently forgotten. But the legend, *la leyenda negra*, of literary darkness, of cultural backwardness, still persists. The learned Director of Research in Europe for the Argentine Instituto de Investigaciones Historicas had the black legend in mind when he wrote his scholarly work on "books, printing and journalism in America under the Spanish régime." His conclusions, buttressed by an array of authorities and rendered more graphic by forty full-page plates, are interesting, to say the least.

Doctor Revello has spent seventeen years among the pertinent original documents. He has also endeavored to master all the secondary sources, scholarly and trashy, which might influence his final judgment. He has been very frank in his exposition of the prohibitive legislation of the mother country during the

colonial period. But he is equally clear in correcting a fallacious first impression. Laws there were in oppressive abundance, but in practice "the American colonials read what they liked," at least so far as readings of any cultural value were concerned. And this holds for the whole period from the sixteenth century on. Aside from the appendix, which comprises roughly about half of the whole book, the author has compressed so much erudition into his voluminous foot-notes that his narrative text almost recedes into a minor position. In any case, we have here a valuable contribution to an important subject. R. CORRIGAN.

The American Department of the British Government, 1768-1782, by Margaret Marion Spector. Columbia University Press. New York. 1940. pp. 181. \$2.25

This is a scholarly study of an important branch of the English Secretariate of State during the momentous years 1768-1782. The Colonial Department, which came to be known more generally as the American Department, was a political creation. Intended as a part of the secretariate charged with colonial affairs, it was originally planned as the equal of the two already existing branches, that of the North and that of the South. This equality, however, proved to be more theoretical than real, and the many little conflicts between the three secretaries present an interesting commentary on the departmental organization of the home government.

Besides a description of the functions of the American Department and its secretaries, under-secretaries and clerks, Dr. Spector gives us a glimpse of the methods of the British governmental system during the period. It was sometimes not very efficient and often open to abuses of many types. Multiple position holding—a sort of political "plurality of benefices"—was one. The volume has an abundance of well-annotated material, a good bibliography and a satisfactory index.

MARTIN HASTING.

The National Archives are now housed in a magnificent home in Washington. 320,000 linear feet (some sixty miles!) of non-current documents await the scholar and research student. A corps of able workers organize, inventory, classify and catalog materials as they are received. To aid all prospective users of these records a *National Archives Guide* (Washington: Government Printing Office. 1940) is now available. We are grateful to its compilers, and we gladly call the attention of our readers to it. One may get a fair idea of what the Archives contain before he plans his trip to Washington. Once there, he is assured of every facility for efficient work. If he stays at home, he can request photographs, photostats or microfilm copies of documents, and have them supplied at cost. The *Guide* should be in every university library.

The *Report* of the Canadian Catholic Historical Association for 1938-1939 is a reminder that our friends to the north are doing splendid work. The *Report* and the Association itself are bi-lingual, a circumstance that should promote friendly rivalry. Since the Association was founded in 1933 much progress has been made. The quality of its membership is a promise of future achievement.

The arrival of Pierre-Georges Roy's *Rapport de l'Archiviste de la Province de Québec pour 1938-1939* suggests the trite thought that past volumes increase in value as the series grows. There is usually more in a fairly complete collection than the sum of its parts. We hope that M. Roy will continue his work long enough to give us a deeper insight into the official correspondence of New France. We are particularly interested in the forth-coming inventory of sources for the religious history of early Canada which M. Roy will include in his next *Rapport*.

With his sixth volume of *Asambleas Constituyentes Argentinas* Emilio Ravignani completes his collection of some 10,000 pages of selected, annotated sources of Argentine national history. Obviously, he has rendered a great service to his fellow-historians by placing at their ready disposal a vast amount of material. But the Instituto de Investigaciones Historicas of the University of Buenos Aires has not waited for the documents to be assembled. Monographs by the hundred have been produced in the recent past, displaying a prodigious activity along scholarly lines and manifesting the patriotic enthusiasm of a young nation. We can assure the Instituto of our admiring sympathy for its work.